DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 718 LI 002 023

TITLE	To Establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science; Hearings before the Select Subcommittee on Education...on H.R. 8839 and H.R. 908...
INSTITUTION	House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	233p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$1.00 HC-$11.75
DESCRIPTORS	Federal Legislation, Financial Support, *Information Centers, *Information Needs, *Information Science, *Libraries, Library Science, National Libraries, National Programs, Planning Commissions, Policy Formation, Program Descriptions, *Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS	*National Commission on Libraries and Information

ABSTRACT

Testimony relative to establishing a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as given in two committee sessions is presented in the form of verbatim oral questions and answers, prepared statements, letters and supplemental materials. Major prepared statements are by: (1) Joseph Becker, (2) Frederick Burkhardt, (3) Hugh L. Carey, (4) Carl Elliott, (5) Robert M. Hayes, (6) Roger H. McDonough (7) L. Quincy Mumford, (8) Carl F. J. Overhage, (9) William A. Steiger, (10) Frank Thompson Jr., (11) Grant Venn, (12) Robert Vosper, (13) Herman Wells and (14) Herbert S. White. Topics covered include: (1) the Commission's charge, (2) a national library policy, (3) objectives for overcoming current inadequacies and (4) recommendations for achieving the objectives. The appendixes contain: (1) text of the President's statement, (2) selected list of special studies, (3) list of regional hearings and (4) list of Commission meetings and witnesses and guests at each. Other documents on this same legislation are reported in LI 002 018, LI 002 024, and LI 002 025. (MF)

ED0 40718

TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 8839 and H.R. 908

BILLS TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 15 AND 17, 1969

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

Carl D. Perkins, *Chairman*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LI 002023

28-638 O

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1969

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

EDITH GREEN, Oregon
FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
HUGH L. CAREY, New York
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
LOUIS STOKES, Ohio
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
ADAM C. POWELL, New York

WILLIAM H. AYRES, Ohio
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ALPHONZO BELL, California
OGDEN R. REID, New York
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, Iowa
JOHN R. DELLENBACK, Oregon
MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
JAMES M. COLLINS, Texas
EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho
EARL B. RUTH, North Carolina

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana, *Chairman*

DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
ADAM C. POWELL, New York

OGDEN R. REID, New York
ALPHONZO BELL, California
WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
JAMES M. COLLINS, Texas
EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho

CONTENTS

Page

Hearings held in Washington, D.C.:

- April 15, 1969 1
- April 17, 1969 115

Text of bills:

- H.R. 908 78
- H.R. 8839 79

Statement of—

- Becker, Joseph, vice president, Interuniversity Communications Council 148
- Burkhardt, Frederick, president, American Council of Learned Societies 102
- Carey, Hon. Hugh L., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York 82
- Elliott, Carl, Esq., attorney at law 115
- Hayes, Dr. Robert M., professor, University of California, Los Angeles 145
- McDonough, Roger H., director, Division of State Library Archives and History, State Department of Education, New Jersey 128
- Mumford, L. Quincy, Librarian of Congress 84
- Overhage, Carl F. J., director of Project Intrex, MIT 138
- Steiger, Hon. William A., a Representative in Congress from the State of Wisconsin 81
- Thompson, Hon. Frank, Jr., a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey 83
- Venn, Grant, Associate Commissioner for Adult, Vocational, and Library Programs, Office of Education, HEW 93
- Vosper, Robert, university librarian, University of California, Los Angeles 134
- Wells, Herman, chancellor, University of Indiana 108
- White, Herbert S., president, Special Libraries Association 141

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.:

- Abrams, Milton C., university librarian, Utah State University, Logan, Utah, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 7, 1969 220
- Agnew, Nancy R., director, Wheeler Basin Regional Library, Decatur, Ala., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 28, 1969 179
- Allison, Mary F., secretary, board of trustees, member, Oakland County Library Board, Farmington District Library, Farmington, Mich., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969 201
- Anderson, John F., city librarian, San Francisco Public Library, San Francisco, Calif., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969 184
- Anderson, Le Moyne W., director of libraries, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 19, 1969 186
- Bailey, George M., chief librarian, York College of the City University of New York, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 27, 1969 209
- Baruch, Jordan J., president, EDUCOM, Boston, Mass, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 4, 1969 198
- Bayliss, June E., president-elect PLA, San Marino Public Library, San Marino, Calif., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 20, 1969 184
- Becker, Joesph, vice president, Interuniversity Communications Council (EDUCOM), statement of 148
- Berthel, John H., librarian, the Milton S. Eisenhower Library, the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 3, 1969 197

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.—Continued

Page

Blumberg, Ethel L. (Mrs. F. J.), Los Angeles, Calif., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 19, 1969 183

Boss, Richard W., president, Utah Library Association, Salt Lake City, Utah, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 31, 1969 221

Branscomb, Lewis C., director of libraries, the Ohio State University Libraries, Columbus, Ohio, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969 214

Brodman, Estelle, Ph. D., librarian and professor of Medical History, Washington University, School of Medicine, St. Louis, Mo., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 7, 1969 204

Brody, Arthur, president, Bro-Dart Industries, Newark, N.J., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 26, 1969 207

Budington, William S., executive director and librarian, the John Crerar Library, Chicago, Ill., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 8, 1969 191

Burkhardt, Frederick, president, American Council of Learned Societies, statement of 102

Cairns, Robert W., chairman, Committee on Scientific and Technical Communication, National Academy of Sciences; National Academy of Engineering, Washington, D.C., letter to Chairman Brademas enclosing excerpts from the final report of the Committee on SATCOM, dated April 8, 1969 165

Carlson, Daniel, Rear Adm. (retired), Newport, R.I., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 25, 1969 217

Carson, Mrs. Gerald, Millerton, N.Y., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 15, 1969 209

Cart, Michael, Federal Relations Co-ordinator, Indiana Library Association/Director, Logansport-Cass County Public Library, Logansport, Ind., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 2, 1969 193

Carter, Launor F., vice president and manager, Public Systems Division, System Development Corp., Santa Monica, Calif., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 11, 1969 184

Castagna, Edwin, director, Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Md., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 19, 1969 196

Clapp, Verner W., consultant, Council on Library Resources, Inc., Washington, D.C., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 4, 1969 188

Connolly, Father Brendan, S.J., director of libraries, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 31, 1969 199

Coombs, Mrs. Bruce A., vice chairman, Washington State Library Commission, Olympia, Wash., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969 224

Dalton, Phyllis I., president, California Library Association, Berkeley, Calif., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 24, 1969 183

Dawson, John M., director of libraries, University of Delaware, Newark, Del., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 18, 1969 187

Demos, John T., assistant director of libraries, Technical Services, the Ohio State University Libraries, Columbus, Ohio, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 18, 1969 214

Devan, Christopher B., president, Delaware Library Association, Wilmington, Del., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969 187

Dix, William S., university librarian, Princeton University Library, Princeton, N.J., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 26, 1969 207

Eaton, Andrew J., director of libraries, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 7, 1969 203

Eberhart, W. Lyle, assistant superintendent, the State of Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wis., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969 224

Ebert, Eloise, State librarian, Oregon State Library, Salem, Oreg., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 18, 1969, enclosing statement on National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act 214

Eurich, Alvin C., member, National Advisory Commission on Libraries, telegram from 211

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.—Continued

Page
Farmer, Mrs. Varelia H., assistant to the director in charge of main library, Cleveland Public Library, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 4, 1969 213
Foote, Marcelle K., director, Indiana State Library, Indianapolis, Ind., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 7, 1969 193
Francis, Roger B., director, South Bend Public Library, South Bend, Ind., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 3, 1969 195
Freehafer, Edward G., director, the New York Public Library, New York, N.Y., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 7, 1969 210
Fussler, Herman H., director, the University of Chicago Library, Chicago, Ill., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 18, 1969 191
Gaines, Ervin J., director, Minneapolis Public Library, Minneapolis, Minn., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 28, 1969 202
Galvin, Hoyt R., director of libraries, Public Library of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County, Charlotte, N.C., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 18, 1969 212
Geske, Mrs. Jane Pope, consultant, State of Nebraska, Nebraska Public Library Commission, Lincoln, Nebr., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 18, 1969 205
Gesterfield, Mrs. Kathryn J., librarian, Champaign Public Library, Champaign, Ill., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 25, 1969 191
Gosnell, Charles F., president, New York University Libraries, New York, N.Y., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 18, 1969 210
Grimes, George H., supervisor, curriculum laboratories, Detroit Public Schools and consultant, information services, Michigan-Ohio Regional Educational Laboratory, Detroit, Mich., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 1, 1969 200
Haas, Warren J., director of university libraries, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 3, 1969 216
Haines, Mrs. Margaret S., chairman, Burlington County Library Commission, Mount Holly, N.J., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 25, 1969 207
Hamlin, Arthur T., director of libraries, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 8, 1969 216
Hansen, Mrs. Lucile F., district library supervisor, School District No. 5J, Westport, Oreg., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 28, 1969 215
Hayes, Dr. Robert M., professor, University of California, Los Angeles, statement by 145
Heitger, Abbie, head, extension division, Indiana State Library, Indianapolis, Ind., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969 192
Heron, David W., director, University of Kansas University Libraries, Lawrence, Kans., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969 196
Holley, Edward G., director of libraries, University of Houston, Houston, Tex., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969 220
Holt, David Earl, director of libraries, city of Austin, Tex., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 24, 1969 219
Hoole, W. Stanley, university librarian, University of Alabama, letter to Chairman Brademas enclosing statement made before the Association of Research Libraries, Kansas City, Mo., dated March 17, 1969 180
Howard, Paul, executive secretary, Federal Library Committee, statement of 91
Hurley, Marie V., director, the Ferguson Library, Stamford, Conn., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 1, 1969 187
Jackson, Edwin G., librarian, Hartford Public Library, Hartford, Conn., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 14, 1969 186
Jackson, W. Carl, director of libraries, the Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969 216
Jeffs, Joseph E., librarian, Georgetown University Library, Washington, D.C., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 7, 1969 189

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.—Continued

Page
Kager, John J., president, Westchester Library Association, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 19, 1969 210
Kaiser, John B., L.H.D., retired, New York State Library School Association, Inc., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 2, 1969 211
Kauflin, Anthony, S.M., Cathedral Latin School, Cleveland, Ohio, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969 213
King, Richard L., head, circulation department, Library, Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 8, 1969 183
Lathem, Edward Connery, librarian of the college, Dartmouth College Libraries, Hanover, N.H., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 4, 1969 205
Levy, Jerome, chairman, Alabama Public Library Service, Montgomery, Ala., letter to Chairman Brademas 179
Locke, William N., director of libraries, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 24, 1969 199
Lockhart, Adelaide B., assistant librarian, Dartmouth College Libraries, Hanover, N.H., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 1, 1969 205
Longworth, Mrs. Ruth O., librarian, Montana State Library, Helena, Mont., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969 205
Luebke, Mary Ellen, librarian, Harrison School, South Bend, Ind., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 27, 1969 194
Marshall, A. P., university librarian, Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Mo., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 29, 1969 203
Marvin, James C., librarian, Topeka Public Library, Topeka, Kans., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969 196
McDonough, Roger H., director, Division of State Library Archives and History, State Department of Education, New Jersey:
  Resolution adopted by the ALA Council, January 30, 1969 130
  Resolution to support recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries 130
  Statement by 128
McElderry, Stanley, dean, the University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Tex., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 25, 1969 220
McKenna, John R., librarian, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 14, 1969 222
Milczewski, Marion A., director of libraries, University of Washington Libraries, Seattle, Wash., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 24, 1969 223
Miller, Robert A., director of libraries, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 18, 1969 192
Milling, Chapman J., Jr., librarian, Sumter County Library, Sumter, S.C., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 18, 1969 218
Moriarty, John H., director of Libraries and Audio-Visual Center, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Ind., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 17, 1969 195
Morrison, Mrs. LaVerne, library consultant, Instructional Media Division, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Tex., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969 220
Mumford, L. Quincy, Librarian of Congress:
  Letter to Chairman Brademas, dated May 6, 1969 87
  Proposed amendment by 87
National Advisory Commission on Libraries, report of the, July 1968 3
Naylor, Lewis C., director, Cuyahoga Public Library, Cleveland, Ohio, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 24, 1969 213
Ostromecki, Julius, director, Johnson Free Public Library, Hackensack, N.J., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969 206
Overhage, Carl F. J., director of Project Intrex, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, statement by 139
Owens, Warren S., director, Library, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 19, 1969 191
Palmer, David C., chief, Readers Services, State of New Jersey State Library, Trenton, N.J., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 20, 1969 207

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.—Continued

Peterson, Kenneth G., associate librarian, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville, Va., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 19, 1969 — Page 223

Pretzer, Dale H., deputy State librarian, State of Michigan, Department of Education, Bureau of Library Services, Lansing, Mich., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 14, 1969 — 202

Rairigh, William N., chairman, Federal Relations Committee, Maryland Library Association, the Kent-Caroline Public Libraries Association, Ridgely, Md., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 20, 1969 — 198

Raz, Robert, institution library consultant, State of Michigan, Department of Education, Bureau of Library Services, Lansing, Mich., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 24, 1969 — 202

Rounds, Joseph B., director, Buffalo and Erie County Public Library, Buffalo, N.Y., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 26, 1969 — 209

Rush, N. Orwin, director, Robert Manning Strozier Library, the Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.:
- Letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 19, 1969 — 189
- Letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 8, 1969 — 189

Sadler, Graham H., associate professor, Division of Librarianship, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kans., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 19, 1969 — 195

Schick, Frank L., director, School of Library and Information Science, the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wis.:
- Letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 3, 1969, enclosing article — 224
- Letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 15, 1969 — 226

Severance, Robert, council member, American Library Association, Montgomery, Ala., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 20, 1969 — 180

Shank, Russell, Alexandria, Va., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 23, 1969 — 222

Simonson, Rev. James W., C.S.C., director of libraries, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 15, 1969 — 194

Skipper, James E., university librarian, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, Calif., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969 — 185

Steiger, Hon. William A., a Representative in Congress from the State of Wisconsin, the President's April 12 statement launching National Library Week — 82

Stephanoff, Mrs. Kathryn, director, the Allentown Public Library, Allentown, Pa., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 19, 1969 — 215

Sterrett, Velva, coordinator, library services, Rapid City Public Schools, Rapid City, S. Dak., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 27, 1969 — 219

Stevens, Nicholas G., director, library education, Kutztown State College, Kutztown, Pa., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 18, 1969 — 215

Stoffel, Lester L., executive director, Suburban Library System, Western Springs, Ill., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 18, 1969 — 192

Stone, C. Walter, director, University Libraries, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 18, 1969 — 217

Squires, J. Duane, chairman, Department of Social Studies, Colby Junior College, New London, N.H., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 19, 1969 — 206

Sullivan, Richard J., chairman, Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners, Department of Education, Bureau of Library Extension, Boston, Mass., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 31, 1969 — 198

Thaxton, Carlton J., chief, Public Library Service, State Department of Education, Atlanta, Ga., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 18, 1969 — 190

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.—Continued

	Page
Thompson, Mrs. H. T., legislative chairman, New Jersey School Library Association, Chatham, N.J., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 3, 1969	206
Thomson, Ralph D., director of libraries, the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 27, 1969	221
Tyler, Jack M., Wyoming State librarian, Cheyenne, Wyo., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 18, 1969	226
Van Zanten, Frank, director, Tucson Public Library, Tucson Ariz., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969	182
Venn, Grant, Associate Commissioner for Adult, Vocational and Library Programs, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, comments on the Commission's role as described in H.R. 8839 (sec. 5(a)) versus H.R. 908 (sec. 3(b))	101
Von Oesen, Elaine, president, Southeastern Library Association, Price Gilbert Library, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Ga., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 9, 1969	190
Vosper, Robert, university librarian, University of California, Los Angeles:	
Position statement of the Association of Research Libraries' Federal Relations Committee on the Report of the National Commission on Libraries	136
Statement by	134
Wagman, Frederick H., director, University Library, the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 19, 1969	200
Wainwright, Hon. Stuyvesant, letter from Vice President Nixon, in Congressional Record of August 22, 1960	120
Warden, Mrs. R. D., Great Falls, Mont., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated February 19, 1969	204
Wasserman, Paul, dean, University of Maryland, School of Library and Information Services, College Park, Md., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 18, 1969	197
Watkins, David R., director, Fordham University Library, Bronx, N.Y., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969	208
Weber, David C., associate director, the Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, Calif., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969	185
Wells, Herman B., chancellor, Indiana University, statement by	109
West, Carlton P., librarian, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, N.C., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 14, 1969	212
White, Herbert S., president, Special Libraries Association, prepared statement by	141
Whitenack, Carolyn I., professor and chairman, Educational Media, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated April 1, 1969	193
Wilson, Louis R., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C., letter to Chairman Brademas, dated March 17, 1969	212

TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1969

House of Representatives,
Select Subcommittee on Education of the
Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 2257, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Brademas (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Brademas, Hansen, Meeds, Gaydos, Steiger, and Landgrebe.

Staff members present: Jim Harrison, subcommittee staff director, Nancy Neilen, clerk; Marty LaVor, minority research assistant.

Mr. Brademas. The subcommittee will come to order.

The Chair, in the first hearing of this subcommittee which he has the honor to chair, wishes to express his appreciation to his colleagues and the hope that in future hearings we shall have the same fine turnout on the part of both majority and minority members.

H.R. 8839 and H.R. 908, the bills on which our subcommittee will be taking testimony today and Thursday, represent a bipartisan commitment by 20 Members of the House to take the first step toward developing a national policy for libraries and information science.

The proposal to create a permanent National Advisory Commission on Libraries and Information Science stemmed from the report of the President's National Advisory Commission on Libraries which last October completed a study of the library and information needs of the country. In that report, the Commission called for a continuing planning agency, describing it as "the most important single measure" that could be taken to develop a national library and information science policy to meet the requirements of the years ahead.

Those needs have never been more pressing. The decade just ending has been the most productive 10 years in the Nation's history in terms of the number and significance of educational measures enacted by Congress. We are investing substantial sums of money on the basis of those enactments to bolster and supplement the dollars being made available by State and local public authorities in our school systems. Sharing in this increased investment have been the libraries—school, public, college, and university libraries—which are so fundamental to the intellectual life of the Nation.

I certainly will not suggest that we have reached the saturation point in providing financial assistance to our schools or to our libraries. Clearly much will remain to be done to insure that these institutions are equal to the tasks history has thrust upon them. But our willingness to support library and information science facilities and personnel could conceivably soon outstrip our ability to plan and coordinate, to develop, in short, a national policy on the basis of which such assistance could be given.

The libraries and information centers of the Nation serve many diverse publics in many diverse ways. School libraries, university and college libraries, research libraries, special-purpose libraries, public libraries, and a host of information science institutions cannot be forced into a single mold.

The legislation before us today does not seek to do so. But there are threads running throughout the system which justify the creation of an independent agency to coordinate, to evaluate, and to make recommendations for new administrative and legislative actions by Government in order to make the system ever more responsive to national needs.

H.R. 8839 is designed to establish that institution. These hearings are designed to help us improve that bill, and to move.

The Chair would like to ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the hearings the full text of the report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

(The report referred to follows:)

Report of the
National Advisory Commission on Libraries
July 1968

LIBRARY SERVICES FOR THE NATION'S NEEDS

toward fulfillment of a national policy

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The appendixes of this Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries contain lists of the witnesses who offered testimony and organizations which submitted useful special studies. Many other individuals in one way or another contributed to the efforts of the Commission. It is appropriate here to mention our particular thanks to Dr. Frederick H. Wagman, Director, University Library, The University of Michigan, whose preliminary compilation of written material at the request of the Commission served as indispensable resource for discussions at its final meetings and enabled the distillation of content for the December 1967 preliminary Report and the present Report to be completed within the limited time available. Finally, the Commission wishes to thank the officials and agencies of the Federal Government, whose cooperation has been most helpful from the beginning.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

National Advisory Commission
on Libraries
Suite 6800 West
200 C Street, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20204

July 1, 1968

The Honorable Wilbur J. Cohen
Secretary, Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare
Chairman, President's Committee on
Libraries
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

In accordance with the Executive Order of the President of the United States, we are pleased to transmit to the President's Committee on Libraries the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. The Commission believes that its six broad objectives for the transitional and future development of library and information services can be achieved responsibly and realistically through the structural and organizational recommendations set forth in these pages.

The Commission has tried diligently to meet its charge as set forth in Chapter 1 of this Report. We have met eleven times as a full Commission to discuss library problems and potentials as perceived by a most interesting diversity of viewpoints represented by our membership. We have heard formal testimony and had informal discussions with technological experts, librarians, people from government and private agencies, and a variety of users and producers of both conventional literary material and newer forms of informational transfer. Regional hearings were held in communities throughout the country by members of the Commission to ascertain the people's library needs at the grass roots of our nation. Special studies on a number of relevant topics, in most cases specially commissioned by us, were submitted to the Commission and contributed to our deliberations on problems and issues. Already, areas for vital new research are evident.

On the basis of deliberations through early December 1967, the Commission had agreed on its recommendations and reached some basic conclusions on fulfilling the national policy we recommend for library services appropriate to the needs of the people. We presented these conclusions and our specific recommendations in a preliminary Report dated December 1967. Since then, the Commission has prepared a chapter analyzing its response to the President's charge, completed a statement on library manpower for Chapter 3, and made certain other refinements and modifications in the five basic recommendations now set forth in Chapter 4.

The work we have started can continue most meaningfully through the combined efforts of many existing and evolving entities, coordinated by the overall planning efforts of our recommended National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. There must be continuing, coordinated study and action in the years ahead -- it is an ongoing, never-ending venture. Because the results of all the activities of the present Commission can continue to provide resource on library and information science and service in the future, we are supplementing our Report with a forthcoming volume which will be based on a variety of materials and data, including the special studies, in an attempt to synthesize and document a complex set of problems and issues.

At this time, it is our hope that the President's Committee on Libraries will study our Report and commend our proposals for action to the early attention of the President and the Congress. The problems are urgent. A sound beginning can be made.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas M. Knight
Chairman, National Advisory
Commission on Libraries
President, Duke University

MEMBERSHIP OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES

Chairman

Douglas M. Knight
President
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Vice Chairman

Frederick H. Burkhardt
President
American Council of Learned Societies
New York, New York

***

Estelle Brodman
Librarian and Professor of Medical History
Washington University School of Medicine
St. Louis, Missouri

Launor F. Carter
Vice President and Manager
Public Systems Division
System Development Corporation
Santa Monica, California

Verner W. Clapp
Consultant
Council on Library Resources
Washington, D. C.

Carl Elliott
Attorney at Law
Jasper, Alabama

Alvin C. Eurich
President
Academy for Educational Development
New York, New York

Mildred P. Frary
Director of Library Services
City Schools Libraries
Los Angeles, California

Herman H. Fussler
Director of the University Library and Professor in the Graduate Library School
The University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Marian G. Gallagher
Professor of Law and Law Librarian
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

Emerson Greenaway
Director
Free Library of Philadelphia
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Caryl P. Haskins
President
Carnegie Institution of Washington
Washington, D. C.

William N. Hubbard, Jr.
Dean
University of Michigan Medical School
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Dan Lacy
Senior Vice President
McGraw-Hill Book Company
New York, New York

Mrs. Merlin M. Moore
Supervisor of Economic Education
State Department of Education
State Capitol
Little Rock, Arkansas

Carl F. J. Overhage
Professor of Engineering
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Harry H. Ransom
Chancellor
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

Wilbur L. Schramm
Director
Institute for Communication Research
Stanford University
Stanford, California

Mrs. George Rodney Wallace
Trustee
Fitchburg Public Library
Fitchburg, Massachusetts

Stephen J. Wright
President
United Negro College Fund, Inc.
New York, New York

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

Melville J. Ruggles, Executive Director
(November 1, 1966-December 31, 1967)
Daniel J. Reed, Deputy Director
(January 1, 1967-December 31, 1967)
E. Shepley Nourse, Editor
(August 15, 1967-__________)
Mary Alice Hedge, Administrative Officer
(August 1, 1967-__________)
Richard K. Burns, Research Associate
(September 11, 1967-December 31, 1967)

FOREWORD

When the President appointed the National Advisory Commission on Libraries more than a year ago, he gave it a demanding task, and one with urgent as well as enduring aspects. He asked the Commission to consider the nation's library structure, the nature of the present and wisest possible future involvement of Federal support in the development of national library and informational resources, and the most effective shaping of those resources to our common need as we can picture it over the next decade. This third concern of the Commission has been for resources of every kind, and needs at every level. We know very well how difficult it is to relate Federal and local, public and private sources of support and definitions of purpose, but we have tried to suggest some of the ways in which that crucial job can be done.

Our recommendations will be understood best, I think, by seeing them as they result from our basic concern for adequate library resources. This concern may in its turn seem simple or self-evident until we look at the history of libraries and the needs of this country in the late 20th century--needs which grow equally from the individual citizen and the large corporation, the pioneering university and the complex Federal agency. The historical growth of libraries is a vivid commentary on our problems today, in fact, for we see at major periods in the past the development of one or two particular kinds of library. Today we have the whole array of libraries alive at once; our world demands this variety, while our achievements and our great need grow from it. We are Alexandrian or Renaissance citizens in our development of great book and manuscript collections which range across the past of Western culture; we are Roman or Baroque in many of our superb private and personally shaped libraries; we are medievalists in our development of libraries for specialized fields of learning; and we continue the public or national traditions of the 18th and 19th centuries in our great Federal, municipal, and university libraries. Just as we have an astonishing range of demands on our libraries, so we have range in the kinds of library we create and support.

But what in fact do we mean by a library? We must ask this elementary question, because we are surrounded, almost overwhelmed, by the tangible fact of libraries. We take their meaning, like their existence, too much for granted. That existence and meaning are best understood, perhaps, by realizing what libraries are not -- not warehouses of books and manuscripts, not collections of reading-rooms, and not sets of reading devices. Any library is instead a particular kind of meeting-place, and it grows from certain major attributes of the human mind and spirit. It is not a neutral spot, not passive, and yet it does not have restrictive purpose or direction as a thoughtful radio or television show does. A library differs from other systems of communication, indeed, precisely because its value and power emerge from the use which we as individuals choose to make of it.

A library -- great or small, privately or publicly supported -- has two major and unique functions. First, it makes possible meetings of mind and idea which are not limited by our normal boundaries of time, space, and social or economic level. An effective library gives us the option of moving to the far side of the world, to the fifth century B. C., or to the company of prophets and princes. And we do all this, not by the transient means of fantasy, but by the enduring power of our own human awareness. We can become more than we were; we can, if we wish it, increase our individual stature as well as our public effectiveness.

To say this is to suggest the second great function of a library. It is the institution in our society which allows and encourages the development, the extension of ideas -- not their passive absorption, but their active generation. Here our image of the conventional reading-room may interfere. We picture a hundred silent, inert figures, and forget that each is making some active reckoning with all that he thought to be true before he confronted a new range of ideas or conditions. He may be more active at that quiet moment, in fact, than at any other time in his life. The technical means of his encounter may be a record, a tape, a film, a print-out or -- most radical of all -- a book. Libraries are not bounded by means; they will and should employ any means to achieve their ends.

At a time of great technical virtuosity it is important to realize that in the predictable future new means of information storage and retrieval will not displace the book. Nor will they lessen the need for materials, buildings, or skilled staff. Instead they will extend and supplement what we now have, and our investments during the next decade must take equal account of the enduring purposes of libraries and the diverse emergent means of strengthening them.

Clearly, of course, libraries cannot achieve their ends for the

illiterate or the indifferent. They are dependent on teachers, writers, parents to set interest alight, but they are the means of meeting the interest, and giving it range beyond those who first stirred it. This creative center which is a library should not be defined by the adequacy of its space, equipment, and collections alone, but by the adequacy of its people -- those who first teach the mind to inquire, and those in the libraries who can show it how to inquire. The librarian of today and tomorrow must have many technical and professional skills, but above all he must have skill with people. He is a teacher whose subject is learning itself, and his class has no limits on age, field of study, or degree of competence. The national policy which we propose is as a result based equally on the need for skilled and sensitive people, bold and yet imaginative technical means, and support from every sector of the economy as well as every major level of government.

Douglas M. Knight
Chairman, National Advisory
Commission on Libraries
President, Duke University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments ii

Letter of Transmittal iii

Membership of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries v

Staff of the Commission vi

Foreword. by Douglas M. Knight vii

Chapter 1. The Commission's Charge 1
- **Evolving Responsiveness to User Needs** 2
- **The Fragmentation of Efforts** 6
- **Sources and Uses of Funds** 9
- **The Criterion of Social Value** 13

Chapter 2. A National Library Policy 15
- **The International Dimension** 18

Chapter 3. Objectives for Overcoming Current Inadequacies 20
- **Formal Education at All Levels** 20
- **The Public at Large** 23
- **Research in All Fields at All Levels** 26
- **Bibliographic Access** 27
- **Physical Access** 29
- **Library Manpower** 30
- **Conclusion** 33

Chapter 4. Recommendations for Achieving the Objectives 34
- **National Commission on Libraries and Information Science** 34
- **The Library of Congress: The National Library of the United States** 35
- **Federal Institute of Library and Information Science** 39
- **United States Office of Education** 42
- **State Library Agencies** 43
- **Conclusion** 44

Summary of Objectives and Recommendations 45

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

Appendixes 46

A. Text of the President's Statement and the Executive Order Establishing the President's Committee on Libraries and the National Advisory Commission on Libraries 47

B. Select List of Special Studies 53

C. List of Regional Hearings 55

D. List of Commission Meetings and Witnesses and Guests at Each......................... 57

Chapter 1

THE COMMISSION'S CHARGE

In the Executive Order of September 2, 1966 (see Appendix A), the National Advisory Commission on Libraries was charged to:

> **(1) Make a comprehensive study and appraisal of the role of libraries as resources for scholarly pursuits, as centers for the dissemination of knowledge, and as components of the evolving national information systems;**
>
> **(2) Appraise the policies, programs, and practices of public agencies and private institutions and organizations, together with other factors, which have a bearing on the role and effective utilization of libraries;**
>
> **(3) Appraise library funding, including Federal support of libraries, to determine how funds available for the construction and support of libraries and library services can be more effectively and efficiently utilized; and**
>
> **(4) Develop recommendations for action by Government or private institutions and organizations designed to ensure an effective and efficient library system for the Nation.**

The Commission tried conscientiously to meet these charges. In particular, it attempted a broad look at the complex roles of libraries in relation to user needs in a changing society, and it developed some recommendations for structural adaptations that can foster evolutionary development and enable continuing, coordinated study and action in the years ahead. The Commission's conclusions with respect to major objectives and its five specific recommendations for realizing these objectives are the basic subject matter of this Report. Chapters 2 through 4 present the rationale for the Commission's response to point 4 in the Executive Order.

Here in Chapter 1, however, it seems appropriate to comment on the response of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries to the first three points set forth in the Executive Order.

In some areas the Commission feels it would be presumptuous to make premature judgments on the basis of current evidence, but even in these cases some tentative judgments can be made. The discussion that follows touches on many areas, including some still confused by questions affecting the philosophy, administration, and financing of library and information services for the nation's needs. Tackling the imponderables is part of the job ahead.

Evolving Responsiveness to User Needs

With respect to point 1 in the original charge, the National Advisory Commission on Libraries approached its appraisal of the role of libraries in several ways. It arranged to hear a variety of testimony (see Appendixes C and D); it sponsored several major studies on basic aspects of the roles of libraries -- notably the System Development Corporation report on Technology and Libraries and the American Council of Learned Societies' study On Research Libraries (see Appendix B); and its members have discussed the issues at some length and familiarized themselves with many of the other major studies that fall into this general area. As a result of this effort, the Commission has reached a number of conclusions that have led to its specific recommendations.

The Commission believes that libraries are both essential and major elements in providing resources for scholarship in almost all fields of knowledge, in serving as centers for the dissemination of knowledge, and in serving as components in the evolving national information systems. The library role in these matters is in fact so critical that the Commission believes that libraries serving these purposes must be significantly strengthened. This increased strength will require a variety of different approaches and techniques; Federal support, long-range planning, and better coordination are all urgent requirements.

In the Statement by the President accompanying the Executive Order, three serious questions were asked about the future of our libraries. One of these was quite similar to the item in point 1 of the

Commission's charge about the role of libraries as components of evolving national information systems. It asked:

> -- What part can libraries play in the development of our communications and information-exchange networks?

In considering the role of libraries in national information systems and in communications and information-exchange networks, the Commission found many uncertainties, often further complicated by semantic confusion and a tendency to polarize conventional written information and scientific and technical data. The National Advisory Commission on Libraries favors resolving the uncertainties through multiple but coordinated planning and experimentation. It urges an evolutionary development responsive to user needs, whether it is simple interlibrary cooperation or a highly technical communications system. Some points supporting this conclusion appear to be already evident.

Libraries are reservoirs of information whose means and ends of distribution are determined by the function the information is to serve in the hands of the user rather than by some abstract set of values inherent in the term "library" itself. Similarly, one cannot evaluate electronic and computer-processed information stores except in terms of improving the function of the ultimate user of this information.

The requirements for effective library and information access for students, scholars, and practitioners in various disciplinary areas and at various levels display sharp and complex variations. Consequently, sweeping generalizations with respect to user needs are likely to be misleading through incompleteness and inaccuracy. For example, some misunderstandings exist because the need for books has now been joined by needs for information in other formats. In some technical fields traditional books may be playing a decreasing role as reservoirs of information. In other fields the need for traditional literary information may actually be increasing. But in all fields the needs are multiple and are likely to become more so as new multidisciplinary relationships emerge and develop simultaneously with further highly specialized needs.

At the beginning levels of formal education, we find that the close adaptation of elementary school libraries to the functional needs of changing teaching patterns has made the book only one of many information resources handled by the information center of the elementary school. It is at other levels within the formal educational system -- the secondary school, college, and university levels -- that library needs are most evident and least satisfied. Here the more traditional understanding of the library asserts itself and a wide variety of measures will be needed, including more collaborative efforts among these libraries, to insure their long-range effectiveness. As for academic research, the library responses to these needs display, even where there appears to be greath strength, severe stresses and great unevenness in access.

The roles of the public library are changing. The relative inefficiency of completely self-planned instruction and the increasing availability of organized instruction within the community have decreased the function of the public library as the university of the poor. Nevertheless, as educational demands upon the public library by the educational system itself increase, and as the sophistication of the community increases, the public library becomes an essential element within the community as an information reservoir for multiple user groups.

It follows from the foregoing paragraphs that naturally evolving systems that clearly serve the needs of users should be given support in their own right at this time. No one can perceive the final nature of communications and information-exchange networks, nor the quality of a national information system--with a single exception. The exception is that such a system will finally be made up of a large number of highly specialized individual components, each one of which should be designed to serve the needs of a defined user group.

The specialized libraries, such as the National Library of Medicine, one of our three existing national libraries, can therefore be looked upon as important models of how a library alters or develops its role and activity to serve a defined group--in this case the medical scientists and practitioners. The National Library of Medicine also engages in cooperative activities. Likewise the largest of our national libraries, the Library of Congress, has demonstrated many kinds of cooperation with other units, thus exemplifying how the understanding of the need of response to a user group (e. g., the Congress) does not exclude sensitivity to cooperation with the larger whole.

Libraries badly need support in establishing new means of intercommunication and cooperation. Only after this kind of support of the existing order has been established can it be reliably estimated what the role of these units is in the evolving national information system.

To summarize, then, and to place the Commission's response to the very broad point 1 of its charge in somewhat clearer focus, the following observations are relevant here. These are shared by members of the Commission and recur many times throughout this Report in various contexts.

First, in order to improve the access of our society to information, the Commission believes the basic necessity is to foster development by an evolutionary process. An example is the application of technology, which can play an extremely important role in improving library and informational operations; the Commission does not presently see a technological solution that will make either the printed book or the library itself quickly obsolete--nor does it see any near-term system that will inexpensively provide instant access to all knowledge at any location.

Second, if the present unsatisfactory situation, described particularly in Chapter 3 of this Report, is to be improved, the Commission believes there should be augmented Federal support for: (a) national or regional resource collections and services for infrequently used research materials in a carefully planned pattern; (b) nationally oriented indexing, cataloging, abstracting, and other bibliographical services; (c) basic and applied research in library operations and in the intellectual problems, technology, and economics of information transfer and dissemination.

Third, it is apparent that public, school, and academic libraries will all be obligated to change many of their methods of work, their interrelationships, and some of their roles and objectives in the years ahead. If these libraries are to be responsive to contemporary and future requirements, the Commission believes that changes will have to take place at a much faster rate than has heretofore been the case. To effect more rapid rates of change and response, funds, among other things, will be required that are not now available.

Fourth, there are, and there will continue to be, many information dissemination and data-handling functions that may be handled in part or entirely outside the walls of traditional libraries--e.g., indexing, abstracting, literature evaluation, synthesis, and computer or other means of access to extensive economic, sociological, scientific, and other data banks. These services are of great importance in insuring effective access to the resources collected, organized, preserved, and made available primarily through libraries--especially those of a scholarly research nature.

Fifth, the Commission believes that the nation's library and other information systems will continue to be a shared responsibility of Federal agencies, the States, municipalities, educational institutions, and many other public and private organizations. No monolithic Federal or other centralized administrative control seems either feasible or desirable. There will have to be many different kinds of information systems and working relationships among a variety of institutions if we are to provide effective access to relevant information for our society. New systems, roles, and relationships are likely to emerge at very different rates of speed in response to widely varying user needs.

Finally, it should be stated here that the tasks of analyzing the needs, planning, setting standards, allocating resources, measuring performance, and coordinating efforts will be difficult and complex in the years ahead. Effective progress will require the sustained effort of the present Commission's recommended ongoing National Commission on Libraries and Information Science working with Federal agencies, the national libraries, and many other institutions, groups, and individuals.

The Fragmentation of Efforts

The second of the President's charges required the National Advisory Commission on Libraries to "Appraise the policies, programs, and practices of public agencies and private institutions and organizations, together with other factors, which have a bearing on the role and effective utilization of libraries."

In an effort to accomplish this appraisal, a number of the special studies referred to earlier were planned by the Commission to concentrate on the various kinds of libraries and the different public agencies involved. These studies by competent authorities included one on the Federal Government and libraries by Duke University, one on

State libraries and library agencies by Nelson Associates, Inc.; one on research libraries by the American Council of Learned Societies; three on undergraduate and junior college libraries, public libraries, and school libraries, respectively, all by Nelson Associates, Inc.; and one on special libraries by the American Documentation Institute. The Commission also heard testimony from representatives of all types of libraries, from Federal and State agencies concerned, and from library associations.

It is impossible to present any reliable appraisal of the policies, programs, and practices of even a single type among the multitudinous agencies and institutions that are involved in giving library and information services to the American people. An overriding conclusion, however, evident from all the studies and hearings, is that there is an extremely wide range in both the character and the adequacy of library services and library resources. The incomparable holdings of the great university libraries contrast starkly with the nearly empty shelves of new community colleges and similar institutions. Residents of some large cities and affluent suburbs enjoy a wealth of library services denied to residents of most rural areas. The schools of suburbia are likely to have superb libraries, the schools of urban and rural slums none at all--at least until the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P. L. 89-10, P. L. 89-750) began to offer assistance. What kind of library service an American has available to him may have the widest possible variation, depending on his means and where he lives. In general, the areas of greatest poverty and social need and the institutions confronting the most critical social and educational problems are those with the least adequate library services. Where such great efforts are required to induce nonusers of library services to become users, we face a great lack.

More detailed appraisals of particular strengths and weaknesses are reflected in the definitions of objectives and the recommendations for action that make up the ensuing chapters of this Report. A forthcoming book planned by the Commission and based on Commission materials, including a number of the special studies, will attempt a further analysis of the multiplicity of users and uses of library and information services. Surely one of the primary tasks of the present Commission's recommended ongoing National Commission on Libraries and Information Science will be broad planning toward understanding and coordinating the present fragmented situation.

In the Statement by the President accompanying the Executive Order establishing the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, there was a question, somewhat related to point 2 in the charge but directed toward the fragmentation of Federal efforts:

> -- Are our Federal efforts to assist libraries intelligently administered, or are they too fragmented among separate programs and agencies?

As mentioned above, there are many current complexities in evaluating and even identifying some of the programs and the relationships between them. The Commission clearly believes that coordination of and cooperation between the organic units of the whole body of library efforts, both within the Federal Government and supported by it, are inadequate. Such a body needs a central nervous system. In pursuing this analogy, it is important to emphasize that a central nervous system is the servant of the organs--that each has its own independent and discrete function on behalf of the whole. The central nervous system cannot substitute for the function of the organ, but the function of the organ serves the whole body only when it is coordinated.

For this reason the National Advisory Commission on Libraries does not recommend that one of the organic units--for instance the largest of the national libraries, the Library of Congress--should dominate all of the other organic units in this coordination. Rather, the Commission recommends that a body roughly analogous to that serving the National Library of Medicine as its Regents should be established as a Board of Advisers to the Library of Congress, and that an Institute should be established within the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to coordinate developmental efforts. The brain of this system is that overall planning and advisory agency, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, already referred to several times here in Chapter 1.

The present Commission believes that, within this system it has recommended, the haphazard fragmentation of efforts can be circumvented and the strength of diversity maximized.

Sources and Uses of Funds

The third point in the charge to the National Advisory Commission on Libraries was to "Appraise library funding, including Federal support of libraries, to determine how funds available for the construction and support of libraries and library services can be more effectively and efficiently utilized." Attention was further directed to the following question from the President's Statement:

> -- Are we getting the most benefit for the taxpayer's dollar spent?

The pitiful incompleteness and tardiness of library statistics, and their lack of comparability, make it impossible to give specific quantitative responses to this series of questions. No one knows precisely, or even with close approximation, what the total present library expenditures of the nation are, or even what the Federal contributions to those expenditures are--nor can even approximately reliable specific estimates be made of the costs of remedying the serious deficiencies in library service that we all know exist.

Estimated needs suggest extensive expenditures in order to approach the various sets of standards adopted by the American Library Association (ALA). According to figures supplied to the Commission by the United States Office of Education in June 1968, it would require a lump sum expenditure in 1968 of $1.6 billion to stock school libraries optimally. Just to make up the backlog of space required to construct centralized public school libraries where they did not exist in 1961 would require $2.145 billion. Space requirements for replacement and new growth for public libraries have been estimated at $1.132 billion for the period 1962-75. As for academic libraries, available figures compare present trend with optimum trend over the total period 1962-75: $1.945 billion compared with $9.891 billion for books and materials, $120 million compared with $360 million for new construction.

Obviously such large amounts are beyond immediate achievement, but the estimates afford some general measure of the magnitude of the financial problem that lies ahead in the development of library services. The present Commission has not attempted to make its own specific estimate of the dollar needs of libraries--in part because the members have not found it possible to evaluate existing standards and do not believe an adequate factual basis for a reliable estimate exists, and in part because any estimate would quickly be made obsolete by changing needs and costs--but primarily because the principal need is to create machinery for continuing examination of changing library needs, for devising means of meeting them, and for determining priorities and costs. This would be the task of the permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science proposed in this Report.

It already seems perfectly clear, however, that the need for additional financial support for our libraries is great at present and will grow rapidly in the future. Population growth, our more extensive educational commitments, the rapidly increasing role of research, the greater complexity of our society, and our determination to achieve a massive improvement in the educational and vocational status of the poorer and less-educated among our citizens will join to require very substantial increases in the quantity and quality of library services.

The present Commission has explored possible means of reducing the unit cost of library service to offset in some degree the total financial impact of the need for greatly increased services. Interlibrary cooperation, the establishment of interlibrary networks, and the more extensive employment by libraries of new information technology have all been considered in this connection. As other sections of this Report indicate, the Commission believes that all of these developments have great potentialities for library service and should be vigorously pursued. Their value, however, will almost certainly rest in making it possible for us to have library services of a form and scope now unattainable--for example in making the holdings of the great research libraries more realistically available to users in smaller communities and institutions--rather than in reducing the cost of services. In reality, the effective employment of these new devices and methods will itself require a large additional investment of funds.

The unit cost of library services is, in fact, almost certain to rise substantially over the foreseeable future. Three fourths or more of the cost of library service consists of salaries. These will undoubtedly rise steadily as the general wage and salary level of society rises with higher productivity. Indeed, the acute shortage of professional personnel is likely to drive library salaries up even faster than the general salary level. The absence of opportunities to increase man-hour productivity comparable to those available in industry, coupled with increases in salary rates, will produce substantial and inescapable increases in unit costs. This is the same problem the nation faces in connection with increasing costs of education and medical services.

Since the principal reason for the steady increase in the cost of library services, as of other social services, is the rising affluence of the country, the means exist to meet these costs. It is inescapable, however, that these should be met from sources of public income that rise hand-in-hand with increases in the gross national product. Public libraries and school libraries are now financed primarily from local real estate taxes, which are inelastic and respond very slowly to increases in national income; many college and university libraries are heavily dependent on endowment income and student fees, which are also capable of only limited increase. The role of State support for many of these types of libraries has been substantially enlarged and should be further increased as a partial response to the inflexibility of other sources of support. Even State income, however, based as it is largely on low income taxes and sales taxes, responds relatively slowly to rises in the general level of productivity and is critically low in just those states especially in need of large-scale expansion of library services.

For all these reasons, the Commission believes that over the coming decade very large increases in Federal support of libraries will be necessary and, indeed, inescapable. Even if this necessity did not exist, however, there would be ample justification for an increase in the Federal component of library support. The problem of research libraries is peculiarly a national one: we need to develop national centers of research collections, national backstopping facilities to improve access to research materials, national plans for coordination, national catalogs and bibliographies, and other apparatus that will improve the accessibility of relevant information. The employment of the newer information technology in libraries--including research to develop its applications, the formulation of uniform or compatible information storage and retrieval systems, and the creation of library networks--are also inescapably national problems whose solutions require national participation and support.

Even on the level of local school and public libraries, there is a great and distinct national interest. Especially with a population so mobile as that of the United States, the whole nation must have a concern for the level of educational and informational services throughout the country. Illiteracy, ignorance, limited education, and lack of vocational skills, and other poverty-engendering deprivations, wherever originating, spread their impact by migration and otherwise throughout the country. Library development is an essential element in such national objectives as the elimination of poverty and the achievement of rapid social and economic development, and it requires and deserves national support.

As for the effective utilization of funds already available for the construction and support of libraries and library services, it should be pointed out that, during the life of the Commission, the Federal contribution to libraries had just been greatly expanded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Higher Education Act of 1965 (P. L. 89-329, P. L. 90-35, P. L. 90-82), and appropriate procedures and staffing were still being worked out. There was some inevitable confusion, and it is too early to reach dependable judgments about the efficiency of the Federal program. In general, however, the Commission hopes that the administration of these acts may be moving toward the quite high level of efficiency already achieved in the administration of the Library Services and Construction Act (P. L. 88-269, P. L. 89-511, P. L. 90-154) and the library components (Titles III and XI) of the National Defense Education Act (P. L. 88-665).

There are, however, some fundamental weaknesses in the present pattern of Federal library support:

a. It is given under a large number of different acts in addition to the four mentioned above. Some such diffusion is inevitable, and even to some degree desirable since it would be unwise to pull library components out of many different Federal programs and put them into one act, thus separating library support from the objectives it is intended to serve. But there is substantial overlapping and lack of coordination among these different acts at present, and they have not been planned as part of a comprehensive whole.

b. There is no program of Federal support for research libraries as such.

c. There is no central program for the development of the newer information technology and its application to libraries.

d. **Although manpower is a most critical library problem, Federal support has been almost wholly given to buildings and materials, with limited support for training and almost none for salaries.**

e. **Effective employment of Federal funds within the States, especially for school and public libraries, and effective State support both depend on strong State library planning and administrative services, which do not always exist.**

The National Advisory Commission on Libraries has stated in this Report a number of conclusions and recommendations to strengthen these aspects of Federal support. Particularly relevant in this respect are the permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science to undertake broad central planning toward coordination; a central Federal Institute of Library and Information Science for research and development; aid to research libraries as well as other libraries; improved manpower recruitment, training, and utilization; and strengthening of State libraries. The Commission believes the adoption of these approaches would substantially improve both the efficiency and the effectiveness of library funding and the use of Federal funds.

The Criterion of Social Value

In retrospect, examining the objectives and recommendations presented in this Report in relation to the original charge, the National Advisory Commission on Libraries believes that questions now unanswered will yield to the diverse approaches and interlinked continuing bodies recommended. There clearly already are, and will continue to be, many challenging problems for the scrutiny of the continuing National Commission on Libraries and Information Science--the very fact that the present Commission, in only the few months since completion of its preliminary Report, has developed additional conclusions and recommendations for the present Report is encouraging evidence of the validity of the commission function in overall planning and advising.

One theme emerges throughout all the activities of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries since its first meeting in November 1966. This is a strong social-benefit awareness, a service orientation that pervades every existing and conceivable library and information function. Perhaps it is not too soon to propose the criterion of social value as the most important in decision-making--whether for broad central planning, more specific planning, or immediate problem-solving. We should look at the value to our people and our culture that accrues from the activities of the user whose functions are to be enhanced by improved availability of library and information services. A library can be understood only as it enhances a socially valuable function, one of which--and one that all libraries can enhance--is the personal intellectual and ethical development of every individual in our society. The variety of the other socially valuable functions determines the need for variety in kinds of libraries.

In this spirit of social awareness, the National Advisory Commission on Libraries developed its recommendations for a National Library Policy, presented in the following chapter.

Chapter 2

A NATIONAL LIBRARY POLICY

> RECOMMENDATION: That it be declared National Policy, enunciated by the President and enacted into law by the Congress, that the American people should be provided with library and informational services adequate to their needs, and that the Federal Government, in collaboration with State and local governments and private agencies, should exercise leadership in assuring the provision of such services.

Increasingly over the years the need for a national library policy has become apparent -- a policy which could permit plans that take into consideration the needs for library service of the American people as a whole. Recent developments which have profoundly affected not only the supply and the use of informational materials, but also the way in which information is used, have made the recognition of this need inescapable.

As long ago as circa 1730, when Benjamin Franklin and his youthful colleagues were establishing what was perhaps the first communal library in the American colonies, he gave expression to the basic principle of modern library service. By "clubbing our books to a common library," he wrote, each member had "the advantage of using the books of all the other members, which would be nearly as beneficial as if each owned the whole." Today, some Americans share the use of collections of millions of volumes, while others still lack access even to meager and deficient library facilities.

By the end of the 19th century the country possessed many thousands of academic, public, and other libraries, all based on Benjamin Franklin's principle of clubbing. These libraries were all more or less self-sufficient institutions, necessarily limited by their local resources, but providing important services to local communities of users. But the need for more broadly based services was already recognized and growing, and interlibrary lending, union catalogs, and other products of interlibrary cooperation were responding to this need.

During the next 50 years, however, it became clear that the library needs of the country could not be met merely by cooperation between independent units having local responsibilities. Several of the State governments led the way in developing regional library services organized around their State libraries, while increasingly through the period the libraries of the country were taking advantage of central services -- of which the Library of Congress catalog-card system is the archetype -- for reducing their costs and increasing their effectiveness. Finally, in 1956, in the Library Services Act (P. L. 597), Congress took a major step to enable the Federal Government, in collaboration with the States, to extend public library services to that third of the nation's population, mainly in rural areas, that still lacked them.

That Act was just in time. Since 1956 the accelerated momentum of events has made cumulative demands upon the libraries of the country which they were quite unprepared to meet, but the experience gained under the Library Services Act has proved invaluable for suggesting methods for meeting library problems.

It is now clear that library services are needed, to greater or less extent, directly or indirectly, by the entire citizenry of the country. Such services are increasingly essential for education, scholarship, and private inquiry; for research, development, commerce, industry, national defense, and the arts; for individual and community enrichment; for knowledge alike of the natural world and of man -- in short, for the continuity of civilization on the one hand and increasingly for the preservation of man's place in nature on the other.

It is also now clear that these needs can no longer be met by spontaneous independent institutions having merely local responsibilities and claiming merely local support, no matter how willing they may be to assist. Indeed, these institutions through the years are persistently further and further from self-sufficiency and increasingly dependent upon the services of external bodies -- public and private, State and Federal, domestic and foreign -- without which their costs would skyrocket and their services diminish.

A principal reason for this exists in the sheer mass of new information continuously being added to the existing stock as a result of the ceaseless probings of scholarship and research -- information which is requisite for the increasingly complex activities of civilization and of modern communities, yet which is beyond the capacity of individual libraries to acquire, organize, store, search, and make available for service. For the efficient handling of this information, a system of specialized agencies is needed. Elements of such an arrangement actually do exist, but on an unplanned and spontaneous basis. The situation requires rationalization through the execution of careful plans in the national interest.

There are other reasons why libraries can less and less attempt to serve as self-sufficient entities but must more and more derive strength from membership in regional or national systems or networks. One of these is the increasing mobility both of people and of industry -- a mobility that tends not only to diversify, but also to intensify the demands upon local libraries for specialized materials. Another is the enormous increase in personnel costs that all service organizations, including libraries, are forced to sustain, costs that compel them wherever possible to substitute mechanisms and automatons for manual operations. A special aspect of this process is the inevitable impact of electronic technology on information transfer -- a process already under way in the development of methods for storage of information in electronic memories, processing by computer, distribution by wire or microwave, and service to the consumer by telefacsimile or cathode-ray-tube display.

To avoid haphazard and fragmented response to the inevitable forces of a changing society, a national plan is required that can be used to guide the next steps of all participants toward a recognized and achievable goal of adequate library service to all Americans. Because of the deep involvement of the Federal Government as producer, processor, and user of information, and because this is a matter closely touching the national welfare, the leadership of the Federal Government is essential to the success of any plan.

A prerequisite to the development of such a plan is a clear enunciation of the policy on which the plan is to be based. In consequence, the first recommendation of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, on which all its further recommendations rest, is that it be declared National Policy, enunciated by the President and enacted into law by the Congress, that the American people should be provided with library and informational services adequate to their needs, and that the Federal Government, in collaboration with State and local governments and private agencies, should exercise leadership in assuring the provision of such services.

The International Dimension

A National Library Policy for meeting the needs of our own citizens does not preclude an international awareness and responsibility. In fact a national policy statement on international book and library activities already exists -- it was approved by the President on January 4, 1967. Subsequent directives to government agencies have further elucidated this policy for the encouragement of education through exchanges of books and of teachers and students, fostering indigenous book publishing and distribution facilities, support for programs of library development, training programs for library personnel, liaison between American and foreign libraries, increased exchange of reference and bibliographic information, and joint undertakings in the development of library technology.

The National Advisory Commission on Libraries shares the enthusiasm of the library profession toward achieving these goals and urges the appropriation of funds to implement the International Education Act (P. L. 89-698). The Commission also commends the idea of a clearinghouse at the Library of Congress to which foreign scholars and libraries might apply for needed publications.

The contribution of our library profession and our libraries to the improvement of international relations over the years has been noteworthy. Their acquisitions programs have attempted to develop rich resources of information from all parts of the world to meet the ever increasing needs of our citizens. They have aided in the work of creating understanding of our society and our policies by making publications of the United States available to libraries abroad. They have participated on a continuing basis in the work of international library associations and of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in its program of fostering education and librarianship abroad, and they have helped restore libraries ravaged by war and natural disasters.

Today, when it is clearly in our national interest to help the emerging countries develop progressive educational systems and provide a basis, through education and knowledge, for peaceful coexistence in the

community of nations, the American library profession can -- through participation in both publicly and privately supported efforts -- make a greater contribution than ever before.

The United States can demonstrate to the world that we support our convictions regarding intellectual freedom by providing free access to all types of information and all shades of opinion for all citizens. Our libraries can strive to become a vital positive force in the social and intellectual reconstruction of a broadening and changing society. The National Advisory Commission on Libraries believes that the basic first step for the Federal Government is to state a National Library Policy toward the provision of services truly adequate to the nation's needs.

Chapter 3

OBJECTIVES FOR OVERCOMING CURRENT INADEQUACIES

In order to fulfill the National Policy and provide library and informational services adequate to the nation's needs, current inadequacies must be faced. The purpose of this chapter is to discuss some areas where objectives are needed: where existing deficiencies threaten to undermine the success of any coherent development into the future. These deficiencies already severely limit or deny effective access to libraries and relevant knowledge for many individuals, but the situation can and must be remedied. A variety of complex responses and changes are required, and these responses and changes need to be developed in a sustained, consistent, and evolutionary manner over a period of time -- and with a substantial degree of Federal leadership and participation. The National Advisory Commission on Libraries recommends that immediate national attention be given to six broad and fundamental objectives. The long-range development of an adequate library and information system will be dependent to a large degree on the achievement of these objectives.

Formal Education at All Levels

> OBJECTIVE: Provide adequate library and informational services for formal education at all levels.

First of all, we must reduce some serious current deficiencies in those libraries serving not only every level of formal education, but also the increasingly blurred boundary lines between these levels.* School library deficiencies, labeled "a national disgrace" by former Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, have truly serious consequences for our entire system of education. The habit of reading, skill in reading, and skill in identifying and using pertinent information are vital in the learning process, in dealing with concepts, in making wise judgments, in pursuing a vocation or profession, in extending the frontiers of knowledge, and in the liberation and extension of the mind of man.

---

*As evidenced, for example, by such phenomena as advanced-placement credit for college-level courses taken in high school and early-entrance programs to professional education.

Recent Federal legislation has already had visible impact on elementary and secondary school library development, in part by encouraging much greater local effort in library improvement. Nevertheless, and in spite of differences from one system to another, the needs of our schools in general for books and other library materials, for adequate physical facilities in which to house libraries, and for staff are so enormous that continued Federal assistance is necessary. The Commission believes that appropriations for school library resources should be increased as soon as possible to at least the full amount authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P. L. 89-10, P. L. 89-750). At this time some school buildings have no libraries in any sense of the word; too often meager materials are housed with notable inadequacy. Provision for libraries should be made mandatory in any Federal legislation supporting the construction of new school buildings or the expansion of existing buildings that do not already have adequate library facilities. It should be noted that libraries in schools serving educationally deprived children appear to be extremely deficient, and it would be advisable to bolster the library assistance provided by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with supplementary legislation to help solve this problem in our large cities where so many disadvantaged children reside. To provide for a more efficient use of materials, equipment, and personnel, local and State school library agencies should be further encouraged to form community and regional systems to provide centralized consultation and acquisitions and processing services for school library materials.

The implementation of a national plan to raise elementary and secondary school libraries to full and continuing adequacy will require far better data on school libraries than are now available. Investigations should also be undertaken on the relative cost and utility of the various types of library materials, which are often indistinguishable from instructional materials; on differing patterns of service, supervision, and library organization; on appropriate standards; on the various means of coordinating school library districts to provide centralized consultant, processing, and materials-evaluation services; and on the means of stimulating the production of special library materials for students and preschool children in disadvantaged or bilingual communities, where children lack the preschool preparation and relative linguistic and cultural sophistication of children from middle-class American families.

One of the most complex problems that will have to be resolved in any national planning for genuine adequacy of library service to the total span of education relates to the difficulty of coordinating the various library agencies that serve high school and college students in urban areas. Because high schools, urban colleges, and junior colleges are often remote from areas where many of their students reside, and because it is frequently difficult and costly to provide the maintenance services necessary to keep the school library open evenings and weekends, and because the school collections are often inadequate to the needs, students have been resorting to their local public libraries in such large numbers as seriously to overload the public library. Coordination of public library directors, teachers, school principals, and various librarians within different geographic jurisdictions is not an easy administrative matter, but evidence suggests that there is a serious lack of such coordination even within areas where the jurisdictional boundaries of the public library and school library systems coincide. New thinking and planning are critically needed regarding the distribution of responsibility and financial support to the various types of libraries within each region if we are to serve the increasing demands of formal education.

As college enrollments have increased since World War II, we have witnessed an almost phenomenal increase in the number of junior and community colleges. In no other type of institution serving higher education are library shortcomings so glaring. The great majority of library collections of junior colleges are considered substandard, and a high percentage of the libraries of four-year colleges are also weak. Of all the difficulties that beset the college library, the most visible is that of inadequacy of library buildings. The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 ~~1965~~ (P. L. ~~89-329, P. L. 90-35, P. L.~~ 88-204, as amended;) 90-82) has been a tremendous stimulus and support for college library construction. Substantial amounts have been granted under this Act for undergraduate college library buildings, but in many instances the combination of Federal aid and local resources has led only to an alleviation of the pressing immediate need for more library space, and not to solutions viable for long periods.

The National Advisory Commission on Libraries believes it to be of great national importance that the libraries serving the undergraduate students and faculties of our two-year and four-year colleges, and also the undergraduate colleges in our universities, be equipped and staffed to do their jobs with full adequacy. To help achieve this goal, the Commission believes that sums appropriated under the authority of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to strengthen the collections of college libraries should be increased substantially, and in the administration of grants for this purpose, special attention should be given to improvement of the collections of the two-year and four-year colleges that are most seriously in need. Additionally, the limitation on grants for the construction of academic library buildings under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (P. L. 88-204 as amended) should be raised to permit a Federal contribution of three fourths of the construction cost, as provided, for example, in the Medical Library Assistance Act (P. L. 89-291).

For long-range college library development, plans should be developed for centralized services to college libraries in acquisitions, processing, and storage of little-used material; in effecting cooperative arrangements that will give college students and faculty members efficient bibliographic and physical access to the resources of research libraries; in arranging for advisory services to college librarians, especially with respect to the utilization of technological aids to library work; and in persuading the States and other responsible agencies that adequate libraries are essential rather than marginal or optional facilities.

As formal education progresses into graduate and professional schools of the university and the continuing education of practitioners, the informational needs become more complex and the boundary lines between education and research become blurred. Inadequacies in serving the nation's research needs are discussed later in this chapter under other objectives, but it is appropriate to point out here that a dynamic relationship exists between all the areas for which the National Advisory Commission on Libraries has identified inadequacies and suggested objectives.

The Public at Large

OBJECTIVE: Provide adequate library and informational services for the public at large.

Serving the informal educational needs at all levels might well be the stated function of the only libraries to which the undifferentiated general public has access today -- the public libraries. There are inadequacies here too, and there are strong arguments for overcoming these in order to strengthen the health of our democracy.

The public library reaches the entire population as does no other aspect of library service. Parents of preschool children rely on it for the picture and storybooks that are the child's first introduction to the mystery of reading. Elementary school children go to the public library for books when school is out and during vacation, as do high school students, who also use it for assistance in homework and term papers. Urban college students living at home find the public library more convenient than their college libraries. Adults rely on it for recreation and continuing education. Businessmen may turn to it for practical information, as do housewives, craftsmen, and hobbyists. The larger public libraries are major research resources. More recently we have turned to the library as one of the social agencies needed to assist in liberating the prisoners of urban ghettos from ignorance and poverty. For all men and women, it is the one place through which they may reach the world's collected informational and intellectual resources.

Yet, important as the public library is, there are few social services so unequally provided to the American people. Residents of some cities can command the resources of enormous institutions holding many hundreds of thousands, or even millions, of volumes. At the other extreme, some 20 million Americans, largely in rural areas, have no public library service at all, and some 10 million more have access only to very small libraries with very inadequate collections and little or no service from professional librarians. Indeed, only residents of cities of substantial size or of areas served by well-sustained county or regional library systems are likely to have access to reasonably adequate library service. It is essential that measures be taken to extend at least basic local public library service to every American. The encouragement of library systems, interlibrary loans, and other similar approaches can give everyone ultimate access to all the library resources he needs.

The unequal distribution of service is not the only inadequacy. Even where public library service is available, indeed even in some of the better served cities, it is usually far below any reasonable standard of adequacy. More than two thirds of all public libraries fail to meet American Library Association (ALA) standards as to the minimum adequate size of collections, and not one in 30 meets ALA standards for per-capita financial support.

There are a number of other quite critical problems in current public library services. One is the heavy burden of high school and college student use of the public library. This pressure will in part be relieved as the educational libraries are strengthened. But students turn to the public library not only because of its relative strength, but because of its convenience. This motive will not be lessened by the improvement of a high school library, for it may still be closed on evenings and weekends, or by the improvement of a college library that may be distant from a student's home. Diverting students away from the public library would deprive them of definite conveniences. The desirable objective would be to assist the public library in developing the means to meet the pressure and serve the student better. Public libraries need to be included in programs of assistance to educational libraries.

Another special problem, shared by many urban services, arises from the fact that patterns of public library service in metropolitan areas by no means correspond to the pattern of local governmental jurisdiction. In particular, the public library of the central city may be called on to render service to residents of the entire metropolitan area, without any financial support from suburban jurisdictions. The situation is doubly complicated when the metropolitan area, as in several of our large cities, extends across state lines. Further means of support and coordination must be found.

Still other problems stem from the fact that the nature of the informational and reading needs of the residents of core cities has radically changed in the last decade, so radically as to require substantial changes in the outlook, collections, and services of the core-city branches of urban public libraries if they are to become effective instruments in the attack on poverty, ignorance, and semiliteracy. The public libraries require assistance, financial and professional, in equipping themselves to meet these new needs.

One of the principal tasks of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, proposed in Chapter 4, should be to develop a national plan, calling on Federal, State, and local sources of support for making adequate public library service available to all Americans. Such a plan should give special attention to the problems of large cities with difficult educational problems, of metropolitan areas with multiple jurisdictions, and of rural areas entirely or almost entirely lacking public library services. The planning should give attention to the coordination of school, college, and public library services. It should consider arrangements for the maximum use of cooperative library systems, and assure compensation to larger or more specialized libraries -- public or private -- when they give service to such systems that extends beyond the demands of their normal clientele. The National Advisory Commission on Libraries believes the plan should provide for substantially increased levels of support on a matching-fund basis.

The term "public library" includes county libraries serving townships without libraries, or with very inadequate ones, and State libraries. State libraries support the public library system in their respective States and provide assistance to school libraries. They are entrusted, usually, with planning State library systems and with the administration of State aid to public libraries. In some instances they are required to provide legal collections and other resources necessary for the work of State government. The deficiencies some State library agencies face are so severe that one recommendation of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries is specifically directed to this problem area.

Research in All Fields at All Levels

OBJECTIVE: Provide materials to support research in all fields at all levels.

A third broad national goal must be the development and implementation of a plan that will insure that the nation has the research resources required for its increasingly complex informational and research needs. The publication of new books and new editions of older titles (exclusive of government publications, dissertations, pamphlets, and most subscription books) doubled between 1950 and 1966. The growth of knowledge and the phenomenal increase in its use is reflected not only in the increased production of books, but in the proliferation of such information-bearing records as journals, research reports, dissertations, microfilms, audiorecordings, and other materials. Increases in the use of all publications are difficult to assess, but a recent report states that the use of scientific literature has been increasing by 12 to 17 percent per year. In addition, there are major new areas of research concern (such as Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Eastern Europe) requiring acquisitions programs for large quantities of material that are very costly, very difficult to acquire, and very expensive to catalog and organize for effective use.

The increase in research conducted by universities and sponsored by Federal and State agencies, corporations, and foundations, has made demands upon university libraries that have not been satisfied by either the growth of library collections or staffs. All agencies of government, foundations, industries, and other organizations that subsidize research by contracts, grants-in-aid, fellowships, and other means should be made aware of the greatly augmented burden on the library that their grants and subventions commonly entail. This should be taken into account in the planning of grants and programs. Continuity of such funding is critically important.

Although many libraries share in carrying the burden of acquiring, organizing, and servicing this vast body of material for the nation, the principal burden at the present time falls upon a relatively small number of university libraries, the three great national libraries (the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, and the National Agricultural Library), and a number of very large public libraries and privately supported research libraries. Rapid increases in the costs and scope of required publications and of the staffs for handling them, as well as the added needs for sufficient space, are severely straining the very limited resources of all these institutions. Existing programs of Federal assistance are not in general addressed to the development or the accessibility of research materials. It is essential to develop and fund a more systematic and comprehensive national program to assist these libraries in the acquisition, organization, housing, and servicing of materials likely to be of research value to the nation.

Research, basic or applied, requires source materials and itself produces new informational output -- this is true of the arts and humanities as well as the natural and physical sciences, the social and behavioral sciences, and many technical areas. As society continues to demand both new knowledge and more rapid application of knowledge for its own betterment, the proliferation of information may defeat its own purpose unless it is adequately recorded, acquired, and available for use.

Bibliographic Access

OBJECTIVE: Provide adequate bibliographic access to the nation's research and informational resources.

It is not enough simply to acquire research and informational resources. To insure that their existence and relevance will be known to those who need them, an adequate apparatus for indexing, cataloging, abstracting, and evaluating their content must be developed.

The work of bibliographic organization of vast collections of books and other materials, and of providing the tools that permit any user to determine their location quickly, grows in complexity with every volume added to the collections and with the proliferation in the sources, the subjects, the languages, and the forms in which pertinent materials appear. Under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (P. L. 89-329, P. L. 90-35, P. L. 90-82), funds totaling $3 million were provided in 1967 to enable the Library of Congress to expand its acquisitions and cataloging program in an effort to provide cataloging data for any foreign book that an American library might purchase. This appropriation has now been increased substantially and the program, if sustained, may prove to be the most far-reaching service to scholarly and many other national bibliographic needs of all Federal library undertakings.

At present the technology of electronically storing, updating, querying, and transmitting bibliographic data is emerging. In Chapter 4, the National Advisory Commission on Libraries sets forth its recommendation for a vigorous program of research and development leading toward national networks that will provide better access to improved bibliographic and related services.

Bibliographic access to the content of the many thousands of journals and research reports in our libraries is inadequate and uneven. There is no agency: (1) to initiate and develop national technical standards that could help to insure coverage of all journals contributing to the total research effort, (2) to coordinate the work of various association-supported, governmental, and commercial enterprises, and (3) to assist in determining priorities in funding.

Despite the seeming wealth of service of all kinds to assist in providing bibliographic access to information in the sciences and technology, several deficiencies in the present pattern are obvious. Except for medicine, agriculture, and the Library of Congress, the responsibility of the Government agencies for coverage is naturally based primarily on the particular objectives and literature requirements of the agency. The commercial services respond only to demonstrably large-scale need in special fields, and the work of the various scientific associations is not well coordinated. As a consequence, there are both extensive overlapping of effort and tremendous gaps in coverage. Moreover, a proprietary attitude in both the Government agencies and the scientific societies as regards their bibliographic products is a natural consequence of their desire to satisfy the special requirements of their users.

There is no direction by any national agency concerned with the total information problem. As separate services proliferate, grow, and succeed, the prospect for standardization and compatibility diminishes. There is clearly a need for national planning and coordination to insure, for all subject fields, including the humanities and social and behavioral sciences, adequate systems of bibliographical control.

Physical Access

> OBJECTIVE: Provide adequate physical access to required materials or their texts throughout the nation.

Plans to strengthen national holdings of research resources and their effective subject or bibliographical control must also provide for effective physical access to the texts themselves. Even the largest research, university, corporate, or Federal library cannot hope to achieve self-sufficiency, despite the fact that it must possess library resources adequate for all but the most unusual needs of its staff or constituency. As the college library looks to the university library in its locality, so must the university library depend on the holdings of other institutions and the national libraries to satisfy requests for publications that it has not acquired. The public library, in turn, may look to State library agencies, other public libraries, or to academic libraries for materials needed by readers.

The demands for research information extend far beyond the requirements of scholars employed at universities. Industry must be able to draw upon the resources that our university libraries offer, since the duplication of their holdings in the depth and extent necessary for many industrial research purposes is almost inconceivable. Moreover, the needs of governmental agencies at all levels, of the professions, of the private scholar, all require access to research and other information not necessarily available in the immediate vicinity. Means must be found to make the full text of documents available in some suitable form and at locations convenient to all users, with minimum delay and at manageable and equitably distributed costs. The problems of physical access are likely to be further complicated in future unless efforts are made to discourage the continued use of book paper with a rapid rate of deterioration.

The present cooperative arrangements between libraries to make materials available are slow and inefficient and are costly to the relatively small number of libraries that are called upon to provide a major part of this service without recompense. Furthermore, the present difficulties in the way of interinstitutional physical access to publications forces research and other libraries, at high cost, to acquire, catalog, and house large amounts of little-used materials. These costs might be significantly reduced if new and effective patterns of joint physical access to materials can be developed. It is apparent that national, regional, and State planning is needed to facilitate physical access to publications generally, utilizing any technological aids that it is feasible to employ.

Such planning will obviously entail: (1) support from Federal, State, and other sources for improvement of interlibrary loan and copying services, which the research and certain other libraries can no longer provide gratuitously at high cost to themselves; (2) the establishment of regional library networks and of resource libraries to serve them; and (3) support for agencies, such as the Center for Research Libraries, which should have Federal assistance in their efforts to serve research and informational needs in all parts of the country. Finally, it will be important in the public interest, whether under the present copyright law or any revision that may be adopted, that arrangements for the protection of copyright proprietors do not unreasonably hinder access to and use of information.

Library Manpower

OBJECTIVE: Provide adequate trained personnel for the varied and changing demands of librarianship.

Recent analyses undertaken by the library profession, as well as the testimony of almost all witnesses before the National Advisory

Commission on Libraries, indicate that the problem of manpower shortage in our libraries is of such critical severity as to merit its being singled out for special mention. All estimates of the number of professional personnel needed to fill existing vacancies and for normal attrition of staff in public, academic, and special libraries exceed the number of librarians graduated each year by the 42 accredited schools of librarianship in the United States and Canada. With respect to the provision of librarians qualified for positions in elementary and secondary school libraries, the situation is even more unsatisfactory.

Before the library profession can hope to enroll the requisite number of persons for training in the schools of librarianship, a variety of obstacles must be overcome. First, librarianship should be made more attractive as a career for men as well as for women. As is true of most professions in which women predominate at the lower and middle levels of responsibility, the prestige of librarianship as a whole is lower in the public view than it deserves to be, and the financial rewards are less tempting than in many other professions that require professional education. General public ignorance of the variety of interesting specialized career opportunities within the broad field of librarianship also make recruitment difficult. A further handicap is the discrepancy between the status, salaries, and fringe benefits accorded the librarians of many academic institutions and those available to their colleagues employed in teaching and research. Finally, there is a long tradition of recruitment for librarianship among only the humanistically oriented college students. Too few scientifically oriented young people understand that the profession of librarianship embraces all categories of specialists who mediate between the sources of recorded information and the people who need access to information in all subject fields and at all levels of sophistication.

A second major obstacle is the inadequacy of the 42 accredited graduate schools of librarianship in the United States and Canada with respect to financial support for staff and physical facilities. It is not known how many qualified applicants for library training may be lost for this reason. To complicate matters still further, all schools of librarianship contend with a shortage of qualified teachers, with a scarcity of fellowships to encourage the advanced study requisite for the preparation of future faculty, and with inadequate support for workshops, institutes, and other programs to enhance the competence of librarians already employed and help them adjust to changing demands. Equally important is the inadequacy of support for working librarians who wish to take advantage of opportunities for specialized training or advanced training when these do exist.

Paralleling these dilemmas is the slowness of the library profession itself in achieving agreement regarding the nature and extent of education or training needed for employment in the various specializations of librarianship, and in enlisting more fully the aid of the various disciplines of the social, behavioral, and applied sciences in preparing library science students for the changing requirements of library management and for the evolving role of the library in our society.

The resolution of library and information science manpower problems will be difficult, but they can yield to a number of specific measures. First, the library profession should undertake a program of ongoing research in librarianship in order to improve functional efficiency and facilitate the establishment of the variety of training programs needed now and in the future. Research in library education itself should be encouraged, as well as curricular experimentation.

Second, library administrators should employ every effort to make all professional library work intellectually and socially challenging to retain the best minds that enter the profession.

Third, the Federal Government, which has already acknowledged its responsibility for the improvement of library service under its constitutional mandate on the general welfare, should assist the profession through a number of undertakings. The United States Office of Education should analyze the library personnel situation on a regular basis, compare it with standards established by itself or the library associations, and publish its findings. It should, further, maintain a clearinghouse of information on all innovations in library education and training and on all efforts of libraries to make more efficient use of personnel. Further, the Office of Education should provide advisory aid to library schools, library associations, and others interested in recruiting people to library work in adequate numbers to carry out the various existing and emerging specialized tasks required.

To assist the library profession, the proposed National Commission on Libraries and Information Science should give high priority to an exploration of professional education and training, including experimentation with alternate modes of library training. The Commission should assist also with achieving improved salary scales and providing better promotional possibilities to make librarianship more attractive as a career.

Finally, Federal assistance in developing library personnel should be provided: (1) by direct aid to schools offering graduate and undergraduate training, postgraduate in-service training, and refresher courses; (2) by aid in the publication of suitable texts for such training; (3) by support of special programs to train potential teachers of librarianship; and (4) by greatly increased provision of funds for fellowships for undergraduate, graduate, and special library training.

Conclusion

These, then, are six areas where current inadequacies exist, and future inadequacies are foreseen unless all participants in the management and use of information can look to coherent national planning and coordinated research and development. The nation's needs for library and information service can be expressed in terms of the need to serve formal education, the public at large, and research of all kinds. The need to provide appropriate ways of locating information (bibliographic access) and acquiring it for use (physical access) is basic. Manpower is a pervasive and very urgent problem area. The six interrelated objectives discussed above form the context for the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries set forth in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACHIEVING THE OBJECTIVES

In order to serve the needs of education at all levels, the general public in all its diversity, and research in all fields of knowledge, the problems of access to continually burgeoning information and efficient utilization of manpower must be resolved. Some dilemmas are immediately pressing and can be handled by immediate action. Other dilemmas are foreseen as still emerging over the transition period to the long future, and thus provision must be made for constant adaptation to inevitably changing needs and improved understanding of these needs. The National Advisory Commission on Libraries believes the five recommendations discussed below provide both a sound base for the future and a realistic means of coping with current inadequacies.

National Commission on Libraries and Information Science

> RECOMMENDATION: Establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a continuing Federal planning agency.

In order to implement and further develop the national policy of library services for the nation's needs, the most important single measure that can be undertaken is the establishment of a continuing Federal planning agency. It is noteworthy that almost all representatives of library, scholarly, scientific, and other professional associations who testified before the National Advisory Commission on Libraries gave high priority in their recommendations to the creation of such a Federal planning agency. The present Commission's efforts to analyze current and future national library needs, assess the strengths and weaknesses of existing library resources and services, and evaluate the effects of library legislation, leave the members with the absolute conviction that the goal of library adequacy will be achieved only as a consequence of long-range planning and fostering of the evolutionary process of library development. This will require taking advantage of present and emerging knowledge in information science; it will require encouraging and exploiting future research.

The proposed National Commission should be charged with the responsibility of preparing full-scale plans to deal with the nation's library and information needs, and for advising the Federal Government and other agencies, institutions, and groups -- both public and private, with respect to those needs. It should be empowered to conduct, or have conducted, such studies and analyses as are necessary for the fulfillment of its responsibilities; it should have ready access to information relevant to its purposes from other Government agencies concerned with library and information services; and it should be empowered to recommend legislation which is needed to enhance and strengthen the nation's library and information services.

The National Commission should be established by the Congress. Its members should be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The National Commission should report at least once a year to the President and to the Congress on its activities, recommendations, and plans in the areas of its responsibility and concern. This report should be published.

The present National Advisory Commission on Libraries recommends that this proposed National Commission on Libraries and Information Science be constituted of not more than 15 private citizens of distinction. This group shall include, but not necessarily be restricted to, persons competent in the library and information science professions. The Chairman should be appointed by the President from among its members. A rotating, staggered membership is suggested so that individuals serve for a term of five or six years.

To accomplish its complex and broad mission the National Commission should be provided with a staff adequate in number and strong in expertise, and with funds sufficient to enable it to exercise the extensive research and planning functions which will be necessary if it is to provide sound advice to the President and the Congress. A suggested location appropriate for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is in the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Library of Congress: The National Library of the United States

> RECOMMENDATION: Recognition and strengthening of the role of the Library of Congress as the National Library of the United States and establishment of a Board of Advisers.

The National Advisory Commission on Libraries believes that the role of the Library of Congress as the National Library of the United States should be recognized and strengthened, and it specifically recommends:

1. That the Congress define the responsibilities of the Library of Congress as follows: (a) to serve as the principal reference and research arm of the Congress, thus serving the nation through this body; (b) to assemble, maintain, and provide national availability for comprehensive national research collections of materials from all countries and in all fields of knowledge, except those for which the National Library of Medicine and the National Agricultural Library have accepted responsibility; (c) to catalog these materials promptly and offer its catalog cards for sale to other libraries; and (d) to provide basic national bibliographical, reference, and copyright services. The Commission suggests that these functions of the Library of Congress, already largely exercised in fact, should be further recognized by adding an appropriate phrase to its title, so that its formal designation would be: "The Library of Congress: The National Library of the United States."

2. That a Board of Advisers to the Library of Congress be created. Its chairman and members should be drawn from the public, including scholarly and research organizations, the scientific community, universities and colleges, and research librarianship, and they should be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The recommended functions of this proposed Board of Advisers are to review the Library's operations and services and to advise the Librarian of Congress -- and, as desired, the appropriate Committees of Congress -- on matters that would assist the Library in the development of its collections and the performance of its national

> services. The Board should be required to prepare and submit an annual report to the Congress and to the Librarian of Congress. This report should be published.

The rationale for the Commission's conclusions lies chiefly in the fact that, by far-reaching legislation and generous appropriations over the last 70 years, the Congress has created in the Library of Congress perhaps the greatest of the world's national libraries. It has the principal national research collections in most fields of knowledge, except of course those served by its two companion national institutions, the National Library of Medicine and the National Agricultural Library. It is a source of last resort to which other libraries can turn for interlibrary loans and for microfilms of materials. It provides a means of acquisitions, for other libraries' collections as well as for its own, of public documents and other research materials not available through the book trade, especially from Asia, Africa, Latin and South America, and Eastern Europe.

The catalog cards of the Library of Congress provide a basis for the catalogs of most American libraries. The Library houses and maintains the *National Union Catalog*, one of the greatest and most nearly indispensable of our bibliographical tools. The publication of its own catalogs in book form has provided a major reference resource for libraries here and abroad. Many of its other bibliographic services have become essential to research libraries and to scholars. Since 1948 the Library of Congress has published the best continuing bibliography of Russian books compiled outside the Soviet Union. It edits the indispensable *National Union List of Serials* and publishes regularly a list of new serial titles received by principal American and Canadian libraries, It provides the subject apparatus for the national listing of doctoral dissertations, maintains a *National Register of Microcopy Masters*, and publishes a *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections*.

The Library of Congress performs many other national services as well. It is the chief agency in providing Braille and "talking" books for the blind. It has undertaken major responsibility for a national program to preserve the physically deteriorating book stocks of libraries. On a contractual basis it has provided a major bibliographical and documentation service to a number of Federal agencies concerned with scientific and technological research.

The Library of Congress in general -- and, in their respective fields, the National Library of Medicine and the National Agricultural Library -- have the ultimate in comprehensive national research collections and provide national bibliographical services that are absolutely indispensable to research and scholarship in many fields and to the whole system of American research libraries. Comprehensive as the collections and bibliographic services of the Library of Congress now are, however, they need further strengthening in a number of areas.* This strengthening of the Library of Congress through provision of a Board of Advisers, definition of the Library's responsibilities, and recognition of the role it already plays as a great national library, is the main thrust of the Commission's recommendations here.

It is a great credit to the wisdom and vision of the Congress that the Library of Congress has been so responsive to many needs. Today all the nation's requirements for library services are becoming so complex that the Library, which has never had a charter or basic constituent act defining its responsibilities, must be formally recognized for its national role and provided with advisers that can help to steer its future responsiveness.

The National Advisory Commission on Libraries does not recommend that the Library of Congress have responsibility for the development, administration, or coordination of a national library system or for the administration of programs of library assistance or grants such as those carried on by the United States Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, and other agencies. That would be a deterrent to its main function as a national library. The Commission believes that the indispensable role of the Library of Congress is in the development and availability of its unmatched collections and in its unique cataloging and bibliographic services. These should be strengthened in every possible way.

---

*This is true, for example, in connection with the previously mentioned acquisition and prompt central cataloging of foreign research materials not available through normal trade channels. To a considerable extent, this must now be accomplished through the transfer of funds appropriated to the United States Office of Education under Title II-C of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (P. L. 89-329) and the transfer of foreign currencies accumulated under Public Law 480.

Federal Institute of Library and Information Science

> RECOMMENDATION: Establishment of a Federal Institute of Library and Information Science as a principal center for basic and applied research in all relevant areas.

The National Advisory Commission on Libraries recommends that a Federal Institute of Library and Information Science be established to become a principal national center of research on library and information science in all its aspects. The Institute should have as one of its major responsibilities the system engineering and technical direction involved in the design and implementation of an integrated national library and information system, but the mission of this proposed Institute must range beyond matters of technological development and application to research into the changing needs of information users and the effectiveness of libraries and information systems in meeting these needs.

This recommendation is based on the striking contrast between the serious inadequacies of the nation's libraries and the rapid progress in the technology of information transfer. One of the great challenges of our day is to apply new technology to the operations of our libraries and thereby give each individual in our society easy and comprehensive access to the information resources he needs to make his work competent and his life meaningful.

The Commision recognizes that this goal will not be achieved by a single sweeping innovation, but rather by a succession of technical advances, some already within reach, others attainable by short-term efforts, and some approachable only through prolonged research activities. The times at which elements of new technology are introduced into specific libraries will also vary with the type of library service. Books and card files will be the mainstays of most small libraries for many years to come, but the large research libraries and a few special libraries will press for the earliest possible exploitation of new developments. Ultimately, the new technology will provide effective links from all information resources to all information users.

The uses of microfilm and document copiers are already familiar to every serious library user, even to some elementary school pupils. In the near future, gradual reduction in the costs of microfilm duplicates and full-size paper copiers will make on-demand duplication compete even more with traditional circulation of books and other materials in responding to many kinds of readers' needs. At a later time, as communication costs come down, we shall also see a more extensive adoption by libraries of telefacsimile transmission to distant users.

Of greater potential importance for future libraries than any past technical innovation will be the utilization of high-speed digital computers and their associated information-handling equipment, for the employment of computers in libraries has already led to high hopes for improved access to informational resources, in spite of the exponential growth of knowledge. Computers will most likely be applied to library operations in three successive stages. The computer has already demonstrated its usefulness as a rapid and efficient accounting device for the control of such library functions as acquisitions, circulation, serial records, and binding, as well as for general business operations; this is the first stage. Second, we are witnessing the initial successful attempts to apply the computer to bibliographic operations. The third and most exciting stage of computer involvement, which we are only beginning to approach, is the interaction between the library and the on-line computer community, in which a time-shared central computer is used as a general intellectual tool by many users working simultaneously at different terminals in a network. Development work is now in progress on the transmission of bibliographic data in such networks and on the more formidable problem of storing and transmitting the full text of documents.

In the course of time, different local networks will be interconnected and we shall see the emergence of regional, national, and international information-transfer networks. What we know today by the term "interlibrary cooperation" will be superseded by a much more fluid pattern of providing access to distant users without preventing concurrent access by local users. The evolution of these networks is the brightest promise of the new technology for libraries, but there are many technical, economic, and other problems that must be resolved before such networks can be operational.

The realization of all that is implied in this array of new technology can be achieved only by a substantial program of research and development. This Commission urges that the Federal Government should actively promote research and development in all aspects of technology as it relates to libraries and information transfer. To this end, the proposed National Commission on Libraries and Information Science should develop an integrated plan of support and cooperation involving the various Federal agencies now sponsoring such research and development work. Such a plan would greatly aid the continuation and strengthening of the current grant and contract program, which involves research and development projects at universities, private and public libraries, nonprofit research and development organizations, professional societies, and private companies.

The major Federal Institute recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Libraries can play an important role in the over-all plan. This Institute should itself undertake multidisciplinary research, development, and prototype application of all types of new technology as they relate to library and information science activities. Its program should be built on a foundation of basic research efforts directed toward better tools for the analysis of library and information requirements, quantitative measures for judging the value of existing systems and services, and an understanding of the relative value of various information-transfer media and of the role of interactive systems.

Supported by such basic investigations, the major research and development activities of the program should aim for further multidisciplinary efforts to improve library work -- for example: (1) through applications of new technology for purposes of saving labor, improving speed and accuracy, maximizing convenience and dependability, reducing costs, and performing tasks previously impossible; (2) through more effective devices for organizing, storing, transmitting, displaying, and copying information; (3) through more effective organization of manpower and service units; (4) through superior understanding of the theoretical foundations of library work and of the storage, organization, and communication of knowledge; (5) through understanding, based on comprehensive studies of both users and nonusers of libraries, both as to their library requirements and also the reasons for nonuse; and (6) through the resolution of legal problems, such as those relating to the photocopying of copyrighted material.

The apex of the overall plan for research and development should be a system of interconnected libraries, established as a prototype network, a model for information transfer by advanced techniques. Such a network, after attaining full operational success, would become the first step in the evolution of an integrated national library system. The National Advisory Commission on Libraries recommends that the proposed Institute should be given the system engineering and technical direction responsibilities for the design and implementation of such a system.

In all planning of technological applications in library work, in all library network or systems planning, a crucial element is the development and application of national standards for the compatibility and convertibility of data systems and techniques among libraries. The proposed Institute should take a leading part in bringing about such standardization.

Administratively and organizationally, the Government can choose among many different patterns in establishing a research and development Institute of the type here contemplated. It is recommended that this Institute be established within the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It may be helpful to point out that the models that were prominent in the Commission's thinking were the National Institutes of Health and the National Laboratories of the Atomic Energy Commission.

United States Office of Education

> RECOMMENDATION: Recognition and full acceptance of the critically important role the United States Office of Education currently plays in meeting needs for library services.

Recent legislation and Federal appropriations providing for: (1) major research programs that greatly accelerate the growth of new knowledge and (2) additional massive support for education at all levels place new and large responsibilities on the Office of Education. Its task would become even greater with the adoption of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries' proposals for a National Policy on library services for the nation's needs, the creation of a nationwide library network, and the widespread use of technological aids to improve library services.

The Commission recognizes the steps which the Office of Education has taken during this past year to strengthen and to increase the efficiency of its operations. The proposed organization of the Office's activities that affect libraries must focus on the most critical library problems: programs, professional education, facilities, research, planning, and development. In addition, the National Center for Educational Statistics must be in a position to collect on a continuing basis the pertinent and adequate library data -- urgently required and not now available -- for an appraisal of present programs and formulating plans for the future. But to carry out these key functions, the Office's staff must immediately be strengthened. The Commission urges the approval without delay of support for professionally trained, experienced people, with supporting staff, to serve in the library programs of the Office, particularly within its Division of Library Services and Educational Facilities. To provide the essential overall leadership, the National Advisory Commission on Libraries specifically recommends the appointment of an Associate United States Commissioner for Libraries, responsible directly to the Commissioner of Education.

With its library and information services programs properly organized and staffed, the Office of Education would be in a far better position to administer present and impending Federal legislation and to conduct efficiently more extensive activities on behalf of the libraries. It could then plan, extend, and coordinate, at the national level, all types of library services for schools, colleges, continuing and adult education, public libraries, research, industry, government, and other agencies. In doing so, it would assist greatly in providing the service to libraries so vital in our time.

The critically important role of the Office of Education in meeting the nation's need for services in support of libraries must be clearly recognized and fully accepted by the Federal Government.

State Library Agencies

> RECOMMENDATION: Strengthening State library agencies to overcome deficiencies in fulfilling their current functions.

Because State library agencies are unable to fulfill their current role adequately, far less their participative role in new joint ventures toward the objectives discussed in Chapter 3, State library agencies must be strengthened. This can best be done at this time by amendment of the Library Services and Construction Act (P. L. 88-269, P. L. 89-511, P. L. 90-154) authorizing aid specifically for such agencies to enable them: (1) to overcome staff shortages, (2) to provide better consultative services to public libraries, (3) to offer special information and library services to State Government, (4) to insure that a full range of library services is offered to the handicapped and disadvantaged, (5) to initiate and encourage research into library problems, and (6) to coordinate library planning for total library service. These are the areas where serious deficiencies currently exist.

In the long-range development of State-related library services, the principle of State matching should be retained. The National Advisory Commission on Libraries believes that Federal programs should give increasing attention to the building and strengthening of regional and interstate library programs where these appear to respond more effectively and efficiently to library needs.

Conclusion

The five recommendations discussed above are the result of the deliberations of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries from its establishment by Executive Order September 2, 1966, through June 1968. They are intended to provide structural innovations and realignments for a planned and coordinated approach to society's changing needs in the years ahead, as well as immediate actions to solve immediate problems. The order of presentation and relative length of descriptive text do not imply order of importance. All are major recommendations. Some relate to all the objectives discussed in Chapter 3; others relate more to one objective than another. All are aimed toward fulfillment of the National Policy presented in Chapter 2:

> RECOMMENDATION: That it be declared National Policy, enunciated by the President and enacted into law by the Congress, that the American people should be provided with library and informational services adequate to their needs, and that the Federal Government, in collaboration with State and local governments and private agencies, should exercise leadership in assuring the provision of such services.

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fundamental recommendation of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, on which further recommendations are based, is that it be declared National Policy, enunciated by the President and enacted into law by the Congress, that the American people should be provided with library and informational services adequate to their needs, and that the Federal Government, in collaboration with State and local governments and private agencies, should exercise leadership assuring the provision of such services.

Objectives for Overcoming Current Inadequacies

- Provide adequate library and informational services for formal education at all levels.
- Provide adequate library and informational services for the public at large.
- Provide materials to support research in all fields at all levels.
- Provide adequate bibliographic access to the nation's research and informational resources.
- Provide adequate physical access to required materials or their texts throughout the nation.
- Provide adequate trained personnel for the varied and changing demands of librarianship.

Recommendations for Achieving the Objectives

1. Establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a continuing Federal planning agency.

2. Recognition and strengthening of the role of The Library of Congress as the National Library of the United States and establishment of a Board of Advisers.

3. Establishment of a Federal Institute of Library and Information Science as a principal center for basic and applied research in all relevant areas.

4. Recognition and full acceptance of the critically important role the United States Office of Education currently plays in meeting needs for library services.

5. Strengthening State library agencies to overcome deficiencies in fulfilling their current functions.

Appendixes

A. Text of the President's Statement and the Executive Order Establishing the President's Committee on Libraries and the National Advisory Commission on Libraries.

B. Select List of Special Studies

C. List of Regional Hearings

D. List of Commission Meetings and Witnesses and Guests at Each

A. TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT AND THE EXECUTIVE ORDER ESTABLISHING THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES AND THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES

1. Statement by the President

Our nation is providing better education to more citizens today than ever before. The result of this expanding effort in education is a rising demand for information -- and a tidal wave of new information touching every aspect of our lives: health, education, jobs, national defense, goods and services, transportation, communications and environmental use.

But merely piling up valuable new knowledge is not enough; we must apply that knowledge to bettering our lives.

In our effort to do this, we depend heavily upon the nation's libraries. For this reason, the Federal government will spend, next year, more than $600 million in the library field.

But money alone cannot do the job. We need intelligent planning and advice to see that our millions are spent well. We need to ask serious questions about the future of our libraries:

-- What part can libraries play in the development of our communications and information-exchange networks?

-- Are our Federal efforts to assist libraries intelligently administered, or are they too fragmented among separate programs and agencies?

-- Are we getting the most benefit for the taxpayer's dollar spent?

To help answer these questions, I have signed today an Executive Order creating the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, composed of distinguished citizens and experts.

I have asked the Commission to appraise the role and adequacy of our libraries, now and in the future, as sources for scholarly research, as centers for the distribution of knowledge, and as links in our nation's rapidly evolving communications networks.

I have also asked the Commission to evaluate policies, programs, and practices of public agencies and private organizations -- and to recommend actions which might be taken by public and private groups to ensure an effective, efficient library system for the nation.

I believe that this new Commission, aided by public and private efforts, will bring real advances in our progress toward adequate library service for every citizen.

Dr. Douglas Knight, president of Duke University in Durham, North Carolina, will serve as the Commission chairman.

The other members are: *

Proposed Membership for the National Library Commission:

Douglas M. Knight, President of Duke University -- CHAIRMAN

Verner Clapp, President, Council on Library Resources

Herman Fussler, Library, University of Chicago

Carl Overhage, M. I. T., Cambridge, Massachusetts

Theodore Waller, President, Teaching Materials Corporation, New York (resigned December 28, 1966)

Wilbur Schramm, Director, Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University

Launor Carter, Senior Vice President, System Development Corporation, Santa Monica

Caryl Haskins, Carnegie Institution, Washington, D. C.

---

*See pages v and vi for the final official list of Commission membership.

William N. Hubbard, Jr., Dean, University of Michigan Medical School, and Chairman, EDUCOM

Alvin Eurich, President, Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, Colorado

Stephen Wright, former President of Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee

Harry Ransom, Chancellor, University of Texas, Austin

Carl Elliott, former Congressman from Alabama

Estelle Brodman, Medical Library, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri

2. Executive Order Number 11301

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

Section 1. Establishment of Committee. (a) There is hereby established the President's Committee on Libraries (hereinafter referred to as the "Committee").

(b) The membership of the Committee shall consist of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who shall be the Chairman of the Committee, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, and the Director of the National Science Foundation, and may include, in addition, the Librarian of Congress who is hereby invited to be a member of the Committee. Each member of the Committee may designate an alternate, who shall serve as a member of the Committee whenever the regular member is unable to attend any meeting of the Committee.

Section 2. Duties of the Committee. (a) The Committee shall:

(1) Appraise the role of libraries as resources for scholarly pursuits, as centers for the dissemination of knowledge, and as compo-

nents of the Nation's rapidly evolving communications and information-exchange network;

(2) Evaluate policies, programs, and practices of public agencies and private institutions and organizations with reference to maximum effective and efficient use of the Nation's library resources; and

(3) Develop recommendations for action by Government or by private institutions and organizations designed to ensure an effective and efficient library system for the Nation.

(b) Such recommendations shall take into account the final report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries established by Section 3 of this order, which report shall be transmitted to the President with the recommendations of the Committee.

Section 3. Establishment of Commission. (a) To assist the Committee in carrying out its functions under Section 2 of this order, there is hereby established the National Advisory Commission on Libraries (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of not more than twenty members appointed by the President, none of whom shall be officers or full-time employees of the Federal Government. The President shall designate the Chairman of the Commission from among its members.

(c) The Commission shall meet on call of the Chairman.

(d) Each member of the Commission may be compensated for each day such member is engaged upon work of the Commission, and shall be reimbursed for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 55a; 5 U. S. C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Section 4. Duties of the Commission. (a) The Commission shall transmit to the Committee its independent analysis, evaluation, and recommendations with respect to all matters assigned to the Committee for study and recommendations.

(b) In carrying out its duties under subsection (a), above, the Commission shall:

(1) Make a comprehensive study and appraisal of the role of libraries as resources for scholarly pursuits, as centers for the dissemination of knowledge, and as components of the evolving national information systems;

(2) Appraise the policies, programs, and practices of public agencies and private institutions and organizations, together with other factors, which have a bearing on the role and effective utilization of libraries;

(3) Appraise library funding, including Federal support of libraries, to determine how funds available for the construction and support of libraries and library services can be more effectively and efficiently utilized; and

(4) Develop recommendations for action by Government or private institutions and organizations designed to ensure an effective and efficient library system for the Nation.

(c) The Commission shall submit its final report and recommendations to the Committee no later than one year after the date of its first meeting, and shall make such interim reports as it deems appropriate for improving the utilization of library resources.

Section 5. Federal departments and agencies. (a) The Committee or the Commission is authorized to request from any Federal department or agency any information deemed necessary to carry out its functions under this order; and each department or agency is authorized, consistent with law and within the limits of available funds, to furnish such information to the Committee or the Commission.

(b) Each department or other executive agency the head of which is named in Section 1(b) of this order shall, as may be necessary, furnish assistance to the Committee or the Commission in accordance with the provisions of Section 214 of the Act of May 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 134; 31 U. S. C. 691), or as otherwise permitted by law.

(c) The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is

hereby designated as the agency which shall provide administrative services for the Commission.

Section 6. Termination of the Committee and the Commission. The Committee and the Commission shall terminate ninety days after the final report of the Commission is submitted to the Committee.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

THE WHITE HOUSE

SEPTEMBER 2, 1966

# # #

B. SELECT LIST OF SPECIAL STUDIES

One of the most ambitious endeavors undertaken by the National Advisory Commission on Libraries was to call for more than a dozen special studies on a wide range of subjects. Social science, history, political science, economics, information science, education, and library science were only some of the disciplines contributing to the studies -- all of which were performed within the limited space of a few months.

Most of these special studies, commissioned by or made available to the Commission, contributed at least partially to Commission decision-making, although there was by no means a total endorsement of every position or recommended action in even the most highly acclaimed studies. All will be made available to the United States Office of Education for consideration for the Educational Research Information Center (ERIC), and several will appear elsewhere -- notably in a forthcoming book based on Commission activity.

The list on the following page includes those special studies the Commission judged to be relevant to the problems with which it was concerned and worthy of serious consideration, although a few are of mostly descriptive value. Studies, or parts of studies, that were not completed in time for careful study by the membership are not included on the list, nor are those deemed to be of little or no immediate relevance to Commission decision-making in the form in which they were submitted.

	Title of Study	Agency Conducting Study
1.	Technology and Libraries	System Development Corporation
2.	On Research Libraries*	American Council of Learned Societies
3.	The Impact of Technology on the Library Building*	Educational Facilities Laboratories
4.	The Federal Government and Libraries	Duke University
5.	American State Libraries and State Library Agencies	Nelson Associates, Inc.
6.	Impact of Social Change on Libraries	National Book Committee
7.	On the Economics of Library Operation	Mathematica
8.	The Use of Libraries and the Conditions That Promote Their Use	The Academy for Educational Development, Inc.
9.	Special Libraries: Problems and Cooperative Potentials	American Documentation Institute
10.	School Libraries in the United States	Nelson Associates, Inc.
11.	Undergraduate and Junior College Libraries in the United States	Nelson Associates, Inc.
12.	Public Libraries in the United States	Nelson Associates, Inc.
13.	Libraries and Industry	Programming Services, Inc.

---

*Not financed or only partially financed by the Commission but offered to ERIC.

C. LIST OF REGIONAL HEARINGS

Another project of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries was designed to acquire information on the people's needs for library and informational services. This was the series of regional hearings, held during the summer and early fall of 1967, at which subcommittees of Commission membership heard testimony from a variety of citizens, businessmen, professional people, farmers, white-collar and blue-collar workers, students, teachers, parents, and local, state, and national officials in communities of varying size throughout the nation. There was testimony representing the blind, the aged, and virtually all religious and ethnic groups in America.

The results contributed particularly to the Commission's consensus on the objective to "provide adequate library and informational services for the public at large" and on the recommendation for strengthening State library agencies. The need to solve library problems by effective manpower utilization was pervasive throughout all the hearings. The forthcoming book based on Commission materials will include highlights from the regional hearings and a complete list of all who testified. A summary table appears on the following page.

REGIONAL HEARINGS

Locale	Date 1967	Number of Witnesses
St. Louis, Missouri*	April 12	7
Tampa, Florida	September 8	25
Great Falls, Montana	September 11	30
Portland, Oregon	September 13	34
Anchorage, Alaska	September 15	22
Nome, Alaska**	September 16	--
Bismarck, North Dakota	September 18	42
Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania	September 22	23
Baton Rouge, Louisiana	October 4	48
Lubbock, Texas	October 6	47
Pikeville, Kentucky	October 20	64
Tucson, Arizona	October 27	24

---

*This earlier meeting was actually held before the series of regional hearings was established.

**No transcript has been received in the Commission office, hence there is no record of the number of witnesses giving testimony.

D. LIST OF COMMISSION MEETINGS AND WITNESSES AND GUESTS AT EACH

The Members of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries convened formally on eleven occasions to hear testimony, to converse with both witnesses and guests, and to deliberate among themselves on a broad range of topics relevant to the study of library and informational services for the nation's needs. A list of these meetings of the full Commission appears below. The titles of the witnesses who gave formal testimony and of the guests who visited are shown as they were at the time of each meeting.

I. NOVEMBER 30, 1966 (WASHINGTON, D. C.)

Guests:

S. Douglass Cater, Jr., Special Assistant to the President

Harold Howe II, Commissioner of Education

Louis Hausman, Assistant to the Commissioner of Education

Jerome N. Bluestein, Administrative Officer, Office of the Commissioner of Education

II. JANUARY 7 AND 8, 1967 (NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA)

Witnesses:

An informal meeting was held on January 8 with representatives of the Association of Research Libraries Liaison Committee and the Committee on National Library-Information Systems. There is no transcript of this meeting.

III. FEBRUARY 13, 1967 (WASHINGTON, D. C.)

Witnesses:

Burton W. Adkinson, Head, Office of Science Information Service, National Science Foundation

Scott Adams, Deputy Director, National Library of Medicine

Andrew A. Aines, Technical Assistant, Office of Science and Technology, and Acting Chairman of the Committee on Scientific and Technical Information (COSATI) of the Federal Council for Science and Technology (FCST)

Foster E. Mohrhardt, Director, National Agricultural Library

IV. MARCH 5 AND 6, 1967 (NEW YORK, NEW YORK)

Witnesses:

Kathleen Molz, Editor, Wilson Library Bulletin

Jean Connor, Director, Division of Library Development, New York State Library

Edward G. Freehafer, Director, New York Public Library

Frank L. Schick, Director, School of Library and Information Science, University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee)

Bill M. Woods, Executive Director, Special Libraries Association

Frank E. McKenna, President, Special Libraries Association

Witnesses (continued):

Lester E. Asheim, Director, Office for Library Education, American Library Association

John M. Cory, Executive Director, New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency

John A. Humphry, Director, Brooklyn Public Library

Paul Wasserman, Dean, School of Library and Information Services, University of Maryland

Eric Moon, Editor, Library Journal, R. R. Bowker Publishing Company

V. APRIL 18 AND 19, 1967 (CHICAGO, ILLINOIS)

Witnesses:

American Library Association Representatives:

Mary V. Gaver, President
David H. Clift, Executive Director

American Library Association Panel Members:

Ralph U. Blasingame, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Library Science, Rutgers University

Keith Doms, Director, Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh

Frances B. Jenkins, Professor, Graduate School of Library Science, University of Illinois

Marion A. Milczewski, Director, University of Washington Libraries

Frederick H. Wagman, Director, University of Michigan Library

Witnesses (continued):

Eileen Thornton, Librarian, Oberlin College

Harold G. Johnston, Director, Detroit Metropolitan Library Project

Genevieve M. Casey, State Librarian, Michigan State Library

Gertrude E. Gscheidle, Chief Librarian, Chicago Public Library

Jesse H. Shera, Dean, School of Library Science, Western Reserve University

Don R. Swanson, Dean, Graduate Library School, University of Chicago

Ralph H. Parker, Dean, Library School, University of Missouri

James L. Lundy, President, University Microfilms

James G. Miller, Principal Scientist, EDUCOM

VI. MAY 22 AND 23, 1967 (WASHINGTON, D. C.)

Witnesses:

Present from the Library of Congress:

L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress

John G. Lorenz, Deputy Librarian of Congress

Elizabeth E. Hamer, Assistant Librarian

Marlene D. Morrisey, Executive Assistant to the Librarian of Congress

Paul L. Berry, Director, Administrative Department

Witnesses (continued):

Library of Congress Representatives (continued):

Lewis C. Coffin, Law Librarian

Roy P. Basler, Director, Reference Department

William J. Welsh, Acting, Director, Processing Department

Marvin W. McFarland, Chief, Science and Technology Division

Abraham L. Kaminstein, Register of Copyrights

Lester S. Jayson, Director, Legislative Reference Service

Paul R. Reimers, Coordinator of Information Systems

Witnesses (continued):

Alice Ball, Executive Director, United States Book Exchange

Germaine Krettek, Associate Executive Director, American Library Association, and Director, ALA Washington Office

Edwin Castagna, Chairman, Legislation Committee, American Library Association

Paul Howard, Executive Secretary, Federal Library Committee

Henry J. Gartland, Director of Libraries, Veterans Administration

Burton E. Lamkin, Chief, Library and Information Retrieval Branch, Federal Aviation Administration

Hubert E. Sauter, Deputy Director, Clearinghouse of Federal Scientific and Technical Information

Witnesses (continued):

Melvin S. Day, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Technical Utilization, National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Edward J. Bruenenkant, Director, Division of Technical Information, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission

Walter C. Christensen, Staff Assistant for Scientific Information, Department of Defense

Witnesses (continued):

Representatives from the Office of Education

Harold Howe II, Commissioner of Education

Grant Venn, Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Adult and Vocational Education

Lee Burchinal, Director, Division of Research Training and Dissemination

Ray Fry, Director, Division of Library Services and Educational Facilities

Eugene Kennedy, Chief, Library and Information Science Research Branch

Alexander Mood, Assistant Commissioner, National Center for Educational Statistics

Morris Ullman, Chief, Adult, Vocational, and Library Studies Branch

VII. JUNE 25 AND 26, 1967 (SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA)

Guests:

Maryann Reynolds, Librarian, Washington State Library

Lucile Nix, Library Consultant, Georgia State Department of Education - Public Library Unit (Library Extension Service)

Carma Leigh, Librarian, California State Library

VIII. SEPTEMBER 6 AND 7, 1967 (WASHINGTON, D. C.)

Guests:

Carolyn I. Whitenack, Associate Professor, Library and Audiovisual Education, Purdue University

Mary Helen Mahar, Chief of School Library Section and Acting Chief, Instruction Research Branch, U. S. Office of Education

William Knox, Vice-President, McGraw-Hill, Inc.

J. Lee Westrate, Senior Management Analyst, Bureau of the Budget

Louis B. Wright, Director, Folger Shakespeare Library

IX. OCTOBER 9, 10, AND 11, 1967 (WASHINGTON, D. C.)

Guest:

Barnaby C. Keeney, Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities

X. NOVEMBER 27 AND 28, 1967 (WASHINGTON, D. C.)

XI. MAY 1, 1968 (NEW YORK, NEW YORK)

Mr. **Brademas.** I also ask unanimous consent that the texts of H.R. 908, a bill by Mr. Steiger, and H.R. 8839, a bill by myself, Mr. Reid of New York, and several other members of the committee, be printed at this point in the proceedings.

(The bills referred to follow:)

[H.R. 908, 91st Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To establish a National Commission on Libraries and Informative Science

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Library Commission Act of 1969."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that library and information services adequate to the needs of the American people are essential to the achievement of national goals and to the effective utilization of the Nation's educational and cultural resources; that the Federal Government should cooperate with State and local governments and private agencies in efforts to improve such services; and that Federal programs and policies relating to library and information services could be strengthened by a continuous process of review and evaluation.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

Sec. 3. (a) For the purpose of achieving the objectives set forth in section 2 of this Act, there is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall: (1) make recommendations with respect to policy in the field of library and information services; (2) conduct or have conducted continuing studies and analyses of the needs of all types of libraries in connection with the demands placed upon them by the users of such libraries; (3) appraise the adequacies and deficiencies in resources and services currently available in school, college, research, public, special, and other libraries; (4) encourage development of effective programs to meet the special library needs of the economically, socially, or culturally deprived; (5) evaluate the results of library legislation, make recommendations for new legislation or for needed changes in existing laws, and encourage better coordination of activities to improve administrattion of such laws at the Federal, State, and local levels, as well as to augment the benefits to library users; (6) recommend methods for support and coordination of activities, taking into consideration Federal agencies concerned with service and research in the field of libraries and information science; and (7) promote opportunities for research and experimentation in the use of new technological methods and devices to further develop and strengthen the Nation's library and information-handling capability as essential links in the country's communications networks.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 4. (a) The Commission shall be composed of fifteen members appointed by the President for five-year staggered terms. Not more than five members shall be professional librarians or information specialists, and the remainder shall be persons having special competence or interest in the needs of our society for information services. The Chairman of the Commission shall be designated by the President.

(b) Members of the Commission who are not in the regular full-time employ of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of the Commission or otherwise engaged in the business of the Commission, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding the rate specified at the time of such service for grade GS-18 in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, including travel time, and while so serving on the business of the Commission away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service.

STAFF

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission is authorized to appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, covering appointments in the competitive service, such professional and technical personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its duties.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, but at rates not to exceed $100 per diem (or, if higher, the rate specified at the time of such service for grade GS-18 in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code), including travel time, and while so serving on the business of the Commission away from thier homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. In order to obtain information needed to carry out its purpose, the Commission shall—

(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable:

(2) arrange for the head of any Federal, State, or local department or agency (who is hereby so authorized to the extent not otherwise prohibited by law) to furnish to the Commission such information as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency.

ANNUAL REPORT AND PUBLICATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) Not later than six months after the close of each fiscal year, the Commission shall prepare and submit to the President and the Congress a report on the activities carried out under this Act during such year.

(b) In addition to the annual report required by this section, the Commission may publish such interim reports as it may determine necessary, including but not limited to consultant's reports, transcripts of testimony, summary reports, and other Commission findings and studies.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $500,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this Act. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1970, and the succeeding fiscal years, there may be appropriated, to carry out the provisions of this Act, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

[H.R. 8839, 91st Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act".

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby affirms that library and information services adequate to meet the needs of the people of the United States are essential to achieve national goals and to utilize most effectively the Nation's educational resources and that the Federal Government will cooperate with State and local governments and public and private agencies in assuring optimum provision of such services.

SEC. 3. There is hereby established, as an independent agency within the executive branch, a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 4. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall provide the Commission with necessary administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) for which payments shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Commission and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

FUNCTIONS

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission shall have the primary responsibility for developing plans for, and advising the appropriate governments and agencies on, the policy set forth in section 2. In carrying out that responsibility, the Commission shall—

(1) advise the President and the Congress on the implementation of national policy by such statements, presentations, and reports as it deems appropriate;

(2) conduct studies, surveys, and analyses of the library and informational needs of the Nation and the means by which these needs may be met through information centers, through the libraries of elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education, and through public, research, special, and other types of libraries;

(3) evaluate the effectiveness of library and information science programs and disseminate the results thereof;

(4) develop overall plans for meeting national library and informational needs and for the coordination of activities at the Federal, State, and local levels, taking into consideration all of the library and informational resources of the Nation to meet those needs;

(5) provide technical assistance and advice to Federal, State, local, and private agencies regarding library and information sciences;

(6) promote research and development activities which will extend and improve the Nation's library and information-handling capability as essential links in the national communications networks; and

(7) submit to the President and the Congress (not later than January 1 of each year) a report on its activities during the preceding fiscal year.

(b) The Commission is authorized to contract with Federal agencies and other public and private agencies to carry out any of its functions under subsection (a) and to publish and disseminate such reports, findings, studies, and records as it deems appropriate.

(c) The Commission is further authorized to conduct such hearings at such times and places as it deems appropriate for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(d) The heads of all Federal agencies are, to the extent not prohibited by law, directed to cooperate with the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall be composed of fifteen members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than five members of the Commission shall be professional librarians or information specialists, and the remainder shall be persons having special competence or interest in the needs of our society for library and information services. One of the members of the Commission shall be designated by the President as Chairman of the Commission. The terms of office of members of the Commission shall be five years, except that (1) the terms of office of the members first appointed shall commence on the date of enactment of this Act and shall expire three at the end of one year, three at the end of two years, three at the end of three years, three at the end of four years, and three at the end of five years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, and (2) a member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.

(b) Members of the Commission who are not in the regular full-time employ of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of the Commission or otherwise engaged in the business of the Commission, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding the rate specified at the time of such service for grade GS-18 in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, including travel time, and while so serving on the business of the Commission away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, and authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service.

(c) (1) The Commission is authorized to appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, covering appointments in the competitive service, such professional and technical personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its function under this Act.

(2) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services of such personnel as is necessary to the extent authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, but at rates not to exceed $100 per day (or, if higher, the rate specified at the time of such service for grade GS-18 in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code), including travel time, and while so serving on the business of the Commission away from their home or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons employed intermittently in the Government services.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for each succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be appropriated by the Congress for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. BRADEMAS. We have a most distinguished panel of witnesses both today and on Thursday. Without further comment from the Chair, I suggest we move on to hear from them.

The first statement we will hear today is that of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Steiger. Our good friend from Wisconsin is a member of this subcommittee, and a cosponsor of H.R. 8839.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank you for scheduling legislation to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as the first order of business of the Select Subcommittee on Education.

I wholeheartedly support this legislation. I believe that a permanent Commission on Libraries and Information Science will insure a continuing inquiry, evaluation, and coordination of our library resources and programs which was begun by the President's Advisory Commission on Libraries.

In order to maintain and improve the resources and services of school, college, public, research, and special libraries, national assessment and long-range planning are needed. Although libraries have traditionally been locally controlled, and should remain so, they are, nevertheless, national resources to be shared as necessary by all who need them.

On the first day of the 91st Congress, I introduced legislation to set forth a congressional statement on a national library policy and to establish a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a continuing Federal planning agency. I would like to emphasize the words "planning agency." This Commission will not control or direct the activities of State and local libraries.

I am proud to say that in my own State of Wisconsin a good deal of effort is going into planning programs to encourage comprehensive interlibrary cooperation. The 1968 report of the Wisconsin Library Association, "Public Library System Development for Wisconsin: An Action Program," states:

> The chain of book resources designed for public library users must have its sound development within the public library structure, from local community, to system area, to statewide and national resources. Without such a network, which will link the local library user to the State and National resources, questions remain unanswered, curiosity unsatisfied, and general information ill-disseminated.

In order for all our people to benefit from the information in our libraries, there must be evaluation of the needs of users, the effectiveness of present-day libraries in meeting those needs and the impact of federal legislation on library development. This information must then be translated into action for improving and increasing our library services. I believe a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science will be an important vehicle for obtaining our objectives.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that the President's April 12 statement launching National Library Week be included at this point.

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON

Libraries are the banks of our educational system. And they yield rich dividends in knowledge and in wisdom. They are a summing-up of past achievement and a stimulant to future progress.

Never have we had greater reason than this year to celebrate National Library Week. For never have our libraries played a more prominent role in our campaign against ignorance and for fullness of educational opportunity.

—Change is sweeping our academic institutions. Our libraries are sensitive to the currents, responsive to the tide.

—Modern technology is revolutionizing our system of public information. Our libraries, with new programs and new media techniques, have become exciting and effective centers of innovation.

—The need to bring the benefits of better education to those who have been bypassed by existing programs is more imperative than ever. By extending their services throughout the communities of America, our libraries immeasurably advance our goal, and perform the highest public good.

For these and all their selfless efforts to serve, I congratulate America's librarians—a dedicated profession of men and women who enrich their fellow citizens, their communities, and their country.

(Signed) RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, Congressman Steiger, for appearing before this subcommittee.

Another distinguished member of the Education and Labor Committee has asked to make a statement regarding this legislation, and at this point in the proceedings we will hear from our colleague, the very able gentleman from New York, Mr. Hugh Carey.

STATEMENT OF HON. HUGH L. CAREY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. CAREY. H.R. 8839 provides for the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science and authorizes the appropriation for this purpose of $500,000 for fiscal year 1970.

My deep commitment to excellence in education includes my recognition of the tremendous contributions made by our Nation's libraries. Too often taken for granted, our school, academic, and public libraries undergird and enrich education, both formal and informal, at every level. The library makes it possible for each individual at a time he chooses, to set his own informational, educational, or recreational goals, and to proceed at his own pace in reaching those goals.

The Congress has also recognized the importance of libraries as indicated by such legislation as the Library Services and Construction Act, title II of both the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act, and many others. These Federal programs have helped our libraries respond adequately to the age of education and an era of total communication.

However, these efforts have been fragmented. Often administered by different units of the executive branch they have been inconsistently interpreted and relatively uncoordinated. The report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, dated October 3, 1968, makes as its first recommendation that it be declared national policy that the American people should be provided with library and informational services adequate to their needs.

H.R. 8839, of which I am a cosponsor, would take the first, most important step in placing libraries in their proper position on the national agenda and in laying the foundation for sound national planning and leadership. Such a Commission will collaborate with State and local governments and with appropriate private agencies to work toward a sound national plan which can be used to guide libraries toward a recognized and achievable goal of adequate services to all Americans. This responsibility can be adequately discharged only if the Commission functions as an independent agency within the executive branch, as prescribed by section 3 of H.R. 8839.

It should be noted that the proposed Commission will consist of 15 private citizens of competence or interest in the needs of society for libarary services, but not more than five members would be professional librarians or information specialists. If we are to control the information explosion and make data serve our social and national goals, the establishment of this Commission is essential. I urge you to join me in support of this important bill.

Mr. Brademas. Congressman Carey, it has been a pleasure to hear your testimony. Thank you for appearing here today.

We will now hear the statement of our colleague, the Honorable Frank Thompson, Jr., of the State of New Jersey.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. Thompson. Mr. Chairman, I am privileged to have this opportunity to testify on behalf of H.R. 8839, a bill that would establish a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. As we know, creation of the permanent Commission was recommended by the temporary Advisory Commission on Libraries created by Executive order 2 years ago. The temporary Commission's report which was submitted to the President last October has been endorsed by the American Library Association and the Association of Research Libraries. I am pleased to note that New Jersey's distinguished State librarian, Mr. Roger McDonough, has testified in support of H.R. 8839 in his capacity as president of the American Library Association. It is my understanding that his successor, Mr. William Dix, the equally distinguished librarian of Princeton University, plans to testify before the Senate Education Committee on a companion bill, S. 1519 in his capacity as president-elect of the association. I associate myself completely with their views.

Mr. Chairman, the explosion of knowledge which this Nation and the world is witnessing makes it imperative that there exist suitable places for the storage, transfer, and retrieval of information. The incredible outpouring of new information will be of very little use to future generations unless this vast accumulation is suitably cataloged and made readily available to those who would make use of it. It is, therefore, of vital importance that there be a national instrumentality to devise suitable plans and surveys for meeting library informational needs and to provide technical assistance and advice to State, local, and private libraries. The bill before you would create such an instrumentality.

I wholeheartedly endorse the provisions of H.R. 8839 and urge favorable consideration by the subcommittee.

Thank you.

Mr. Brademas. Thank you, Congressman Thompson for your fine statement.

Our next witness this morning is the distinguished Librarian of Congress, L. Quincy Mumford.

Mr. Mumford, would you please take a seat at the table? We are very pleased to welcome you before the subcommittee today, sir.

STATEMENT OF L. QUINCY MUMFORD, LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

Mr. Mumford. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.

I appreciate the opportunity you have given me to appear here today to discuss H.R. 8839, a bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

As you know, in September 1966 the President appointed the National Advisory Commission in Libraries to study and appraise the role of libraries broadly as resources for scholarly pursuits, centers for the dissemination of knowledge, and components of the evolving national information systems. In addition, the Commission was to review policies, programs, and practices of Government agencies that have a bearing on the role of libraries and their effective utilization, to examine library funding, and to develop recommendations for action to insure an effective and efficient library system for the Nation.

One of the major recommendations of the Commission was that a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science be established on a continuing basis as a Federal planning agency. I was a member of the President's Committee which reviewed the recommendations of the Advisory Commission, and I strongly supported the recommendation for a continuing body to survey library and information needs and advise public and private bodies as to how best they can be met.

There is considerable evidence that the libraries of the country, at all levels, have not been able collectively, to perform as effectively as they must if they are to serve the information needs of all the people. It is true that the volume of services performed by libraries and information centers today is far greater than at any time in the past. Similarly, the training of professional librarians has improved and expanded, but this is not enough.

Libraries must be able to respond with speed and effectiveness to the rapidly changing times in which we live. Moreover, libraries must develop the means that will permit them to act, rather than react, in meeting the problems of ever-expanding quantity of material in all fields and ever more numerous uses, as well as users, of information.

Just as libraries and information centers today cannot live and operate successfully in isolation from each other, so they cannot be expected to solve their problems in isolation. To be sure, there is already a vast amount of cooperation among libraries. Cooperation is a watchword of the profession. But merely voluntary, informal cooperation is not adequate to meet the national needs of today and tomorrow in the library and information science field.

Today the whole library and information science community is undergoing an intensive self-examination and reappraisal. The chief impetus for this is the availability of computer science and an array of new electronic technologies. These new tools have obliged libraries to take the systems approach to problem solving, and this approach is daily making apparent the interdependencies and common practices that underlie and sustain the library and information services available to most of the people of this country.

With the vast national programs in education, in medicine, in urban redevelopment, in law enforcement and social justice, in defense, in scientific research and development, and so many other fields, we must be able to draw fully, deeply, quickly, and economically on all the library and information resources of every sector of our national life—the Federal complex, the private sector, the academic community—the cities, States, and regions.

It is to provide a focus and a forum for planning for the development of a truly national information system that the National Commission on Libraries and Information Sciences is needed. It is for the Commission to undertake the broad-gage studies and to provide the guidance that are required not only by the library and information services community but also by the Federal, State, and local establishments that have major and often mutually dependent interests in this crucial area.

Some will point out that during the last decade a large number of studies and reports have been directed toward attempts to design a national system to organize and disseminate information in the disciplines and activities of science and technology. These efforts have not, in my opinion, given adequate consideration to the role that libraries must inevitably play in any such system.

I do not attribute this omission to a bias against libraries, but rather to a limited understanding of the actual role of libraries in providing not only bibliographic, but also substantive information to a very broad and varied clientele.

Historically, the libraries of this country have developed along highly diversified lines, with each type of library serving a special clientele and offering a spectrum of services. This development has been natural and, I think, very healthy and certainly in the American tradition, where local needs, local funds and local government have been the preeminent influences.

The great national programs and the new technologies of which I have already spoken, now require coordination across the barriers of geography, governmental subdivisions, and other restrictive factors. Libraries and infromation centers today realize—without surrendering any of their uniqueness or independence—that the fundamental problems they face are common to all, and that it is only by the rational solution of these common problems that they can continue to be independent and unique or even, in some instances, to exist.

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science—adequately staffed and with the obligation to make independent recommendations to the Congress and to the President—would provide that high neutral ground where all elements of the community would have a voice, where all problems could be impartially studied and satisfactory solutions reached.

Mr. Chairman, I had submitted earlier a recommendation for an amendment to this bill that would authorize the Commission to accept grants, gifts, bequests, in furtherance of the functions of the Commission.

You have that in hand, so I will not undertake to read it.

Mr. **Brademas.** Thank you very much, Mr. Mumford. Let me ask you just two or three questions, if I may.

H.R. 8839 as you know contemplates that the proposed Commission should be an independent agency within the executive branch. You were a member of the committee that recommended the National Commission. Could you tell us, in the judgment of the members of the Commission or in your own judgment, the rationale for the Commission being independent?

Mr. **Mumford.** It seems to me that if the Commission is to take the completely objective view and not represent the interest of any particular department or other segment of the Government, and to have the distinguished type of members which it should have, that it should stand as an independent agency, although naturally it must be attached to some governmental body for fiscal and administrative purposes.

Mr. **Brademas.** Could you give us any comment on how the proposed activities of the Commission would affect the several kinds of libraries that we have in the United States—elementary and secondary school programs, State libraries, public libraries, research libraries? Do you contemplate that the activities of the Commission would have a differing impact in respect to these several kinds of libraries?

Mr. **Mumford.** As I would visualize, Mr. Chairman, this Commission would take a view across the board of library problems throughout the country including school, college, university, public, State, and special libraries. As I indicated in my testimony, I think the problems are fairly common, at least they are interrelated, and that it would have an impact upon all libraries.

The purpose or objective would be to make more effective use of the resources of the libraries of the country through more coordination and planning.

Mr. **Brademas.** Let me ask you a question about your proposed amendment, the effect of which, as I understand it, is to enable the Commission to receive private gifts, grants, and bequests.

Why ought an agency of this kind, which would have no operating library functions as such, why ought such an agency to have such an authority?

Mr. Mumford. While it is not contemplated, I believe, that the Commission would have operating functions in the usual sense, surely it might encourage and promote research on the problems concerning libraries. I think if it were possible to obtain grants from foundations or other sources for special studies, that this opportunity should be there.

This is a rather typical attribute of commissions that have been created in recent years, Mr. Chairman. I think in particular of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and the Woodrow Wilson Center, I think it gives it more flexibility to be able to receive funds other than governmental and to use them for the purposes and functions of the Commission.

(The following material was submitted for the record:)

Amendment to H.R. 8839

Insert after section 4 of H.R. 8839:

"Sec. 5. The Chairman of the Commission may accept on behalf of the Commission and in the name of the United States grants, gifts, or bequests of money for immediate disbursement in furtherance of the functions of the Commission. Such grants, gifts, or bequests, after acceptance by the Chairman, shall be paid by the donor or his representative to the Treasurer of the United States, whose receipts shall be their acquittance. The Treasurer of the United States shall enter them in a special account to the credit of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for the purposes in each case specified."

(The sections of the bill that follow would need to be renumbered.)

The Librarian of Congress,
Washington, D.C., May 6, 1969.

Hon. John Brademas,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Brademas: This is in answer to the recent request from your Subcommittee for further information on the amendment that I proposed to H.R. 8839, that would make it possible for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science to accept gifts, grants, bequests, etc.

First of all, may I say that I did not envision any large-scale programs such as those that are authorized in the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board Act, in the Smithsonian Institution Trust Fund Act, or under the National Archives Trust Fund Board. I was thinking more in terms of outright gifts to be spent for specific purposes. The language I suggested is what is generally used in giving an agency authority to receive money from private sources.

Specifically, I envisioned that a situation may arise where the private sector would be willing to support a study that would develop information necessary to the Commission in its planning role. Such a gift would, of course, only supplement appropriation funds and would, under no circumstances, supplant them.

The Library of Congress, for instance, received a grant from the Council on Library Resources, Inc., to have a study carried on by a survey team to determine the feasibility of automating its operations. The study recommended that the Library move forward in automating its central bibliographic apparatus. With the information we obtained from this study, I was able to present to the Congress a sound request for funds to be appropriated to the Library of Congress for this purpose. Consequently, our automation program is now a regular part of our budget.

Another similar example, is that of the National Historical Publications Commission (44 U.S.C. 393(d)). This Commission is authorized to "make plans, estimates, and recommendations for such historical works and collections of sources as it deems appropriate for printing or otherwise recording at the public expense." In addition the Commission is authorized to "cooperate with and encourage appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and nongovernmental institutions, societies, and individuals in collecting and preserving and, when it deems such action to be desirable, in editing and publishing the papers of outstanding citizens of the United States and such other documents as may be important for an understanding and appreciation of the history of the United States." In order to carry out its mission, the National Historical Publications Commission, whose Chairman is the Archivist of the United States, is authorized to accept gifts and bequests through the National Archives Trust Fund Board.

In closing may I say that I suggested the amendment not because the authority would have to be used in the near future, but because it may be desirable to have such authority as the role of the Commission as a planning agency develops.

Sincerely yours,

L. QUINCY MUMFORD,
Librarian of Congress.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Just one other question, Mr. Mumford. The proposed title of this bill is to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Do you anticipate tensions between those who are associated more with the libraries in the traditional sense and those who are associated with the burgeoning field of information science?

Mr. MUMFORD. There shouldn't be, Mr. Chairman. I think there has been a growing realization among the people who are concerned primarily with information systems of their dependence upon libraries as resources for the information that may be transferred through information systems.

I wouldn't contemplate that there would be any serious conflict there.

Mr. BRADEMAS. As I understand it, you and the Library of Congress have been trying, in effect, to marry these two worlds in the last several years.

Mr. MUMFORD. Yes, sir; we have.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Hansen?

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me also express my appreciation for your attendance here. Mr. Mumford, and your assistance to the committee in consideration of this legislation. I noted in your statement the reference to the new computer science. I would be interested in hearing your comments on some of the ways in which computer technology may be applied in the library and information science field.

Mr. MUMFORD. Is that a question?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes.

Mr. MUMFORD. As an illustration, the Library of Congress at the present time is putting its current cataloging on magnetic tape and making this available on a subscription basis to other libraries throughout the country. Eventually this could come to replace our catalog card distribution service.

In any event, libraries throughout the country may use the tapes, the format of which is known as MARC (machine readable cataloging) II—a nationally accepted format—to produce book catalogs, to create bibliographies, et cetera. It's a major beginning in the creation of a network of information. In addition the MARC II format is being used to a certain extent abroad.

This is just one thing we are doing. We are doing a great many other things in the application of automated techniques. For instance, we are developing a system for the cataloging and control of maps by computer. We are applying computer techniques in making information more readily available through the Legislative Reference Service to the Congress. The Digest of Public General Bills is being prepared and printed automatically; we are using computer techniques in providing selective information sources to our research people who, in turn, work with Members of Congress; and recently, LRS collaborated with the House Banking and Currency Committee in the design of a computer-support system for the preparation, maintenance, production, and inquiry-answering capabilities of the committee's calendar.

In many ways we are studying and in fact already applying computer techniques for the storage and transfer of information. More of this needs to be done between libraries.

I think there is a whole area there for a network of information that could be furthered and stimulated by the work of this Commission.

Mr. **Hansen.** In what specific ways might the Commission be helpful in making available some of the benefits from this new technology to libraries across the country and particularly libraries that are in smaller communities and without the resources that we see in some of the large metropolitan areas?

Mr. **Mumford.** I think it would be fundamentally through the role of the Commission as a planning agency, Mr. Hansen, and encouraging and promoting cooperation between libraries. There has been no overall planning body that has been taking a broad look at libraries and their problems throughout the country.

A number of groups have attempted to do this but it has been directed primarily at certain disciplines, such as science and technology, and has been directed at the Federal establishment only. I think that a broad gaged look that would be provided by the Commission is necessary to identify weaknesses, needs, and possibilities for the improvement of library resources, thus making libraries more effective in the dissemination of information to their users.

Mr. **Hansen.** Thank you, Mr. Mumford.

Mr. **Brademas.** Congressman Meeds?

Mr. **Meeds.** I, too, would like to welcome the distinguished Librarian of Congress before the committee and ask some questions, the result of which I guess I am looking for an answer to the question of whether or not this function could be carried out by presently existing commission or group of people in the Federal Government or any private organization.

Mr. **Mumford.** I don't think it could, Mr. Meeds.

Mr. **Meeds.** Why is that, Mr. Mumford?

Mr. **Mumford.** There is no agency or body that has the responsibility for doing this.

Mr. **Meeds.** For instance, we have a National Library Commission, don't we, which is composed of members or librarians of national libraries?

Mr. **Mumford.** The National Advisory Commission on Libraries appointed by the President, was a temporary one. Obviously, within the short time of its existence it could not attempt to solve all the problems pertaining to libraries. I think it did identify many of the problems. But a followthrough on that is needed on a continuing basis. There is presently, as far as I know, no single organization or body that could undertake to do this.

Mr. **Meeds.** That conference or Commission was more or less for the purpose of identifying problems and not making long-range plans for different library systems, was it not?

Mr. Mumford. That would be my concept. The Acting Chairman for a period of time of the Commission is here, Mr. Burkhardt, and can speak to that better than I can. But that would be roughly my concept of the role of the Commission.

Mr. Meeds. Is there not a Federal Library Committee?

Mr. Mumford. Yes, sir; there is such a group.

Mr. Meeds. What is its function, sir?

Mr. Mumford. The purpose of this group, which is made up of representatives of the different departments of the Federal Government, the national libraries, and the independent agencies on a rotating basis, is to study problems common to Federal libraries, to seek ways of improving their services, and to make them more effective in helping their respective agencies more fully to carry out their missions. The Federal Library Committee has no statutory authority. It was established by the Library of Congress in cooperation with the Bureau of the Budget and its members have been designated by the Secretaries of the Departments and the heads of the agencies that are represented on the Committee.

Mr. Meeds. It would have no effect on private agencies, public libraries outside of the Federal Government?

Mr. Mumford. It would affect those libraries only to the extent that Federal libraries do serve the private sector. But the Committee certainly has no jurisdiction or authority to be looking at the problems of libraries from jurisdictions outside the Federal Government.

Mr. Meeds. Could this function be handled by an advisory committee to the Library of Congress?

Mr. Mumford. I don't think it would achieve quite the same purpose.

Mr. Meeds. Why not, sir?

Mr. Mumford. Actually the Library of Congress has no charter or authority to undertake to solve, say, the problems of public or college and university libraries. We do cooperate, of course. We provide many services to libraries throughout the country, but we do not have the responsibility of undertaking to solve all of the big problems of libraries throughout the country.

Mr. Meeds. Let's assume that the bill were passed, a commission appointed, and it began to function and made some plans with regard to long-range development of public libraries in the United States. How would you envision that it could implement these plans, what power does the Commission have?

Mr. Mumford. The Commission would be making recommendations to the President and to the Congress. It is possible that some legislation might result from the recommendations of the Commission. I would not anticipate that the Commission would undertake to impose its will upon other libraries, but I think it would receive the hearty cooperation of other libraries in undertaking a solution to common problems that are national in scope.

Mr. Meeds. Would you envision in doing this it would cooperate with the people who are administering the Library Services Agency?

Mr. Mumford. Yes, indeed, I would think the Commission would work very closely with the people in the Office of Education who are responsible for the administration of library and other educational programs.

Mr. **Meeds**. And the people who are administering title II of ESCA and other library functions?

Mr. **Mumford**. I would certainly think so, Mr. Meeds.

Mr. **Meeds**. Is this how you feel it would largely implement—not entirely—but one way it could implement its plans and suggestions?

Mr. **Mumford**. Yes.

Mr. **Meeds**. Thank you.

Mr. **Brademas**. In view of the fact that Mr. Meeds and Mr. Mumford have been discussing the role, during their colloquy, of the Federal Library Committee, I would like to insert at this point in the record the statement of Paul Howard, Executive Secretary of the Federal Library Committee, submitted for the subcommittee.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF PAUL HOWARD, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, FEDERAL LIBRARY COMMITTEE

The Federal Library Committee is an inter-agency committee of the Federal Government, established under the auspices of the Bureau of the Budget and the Library of Congress. It consists of representatives of the three national libaries, cabinet agencies, and six representatives of independent agencies of the Government, (the latter being elected for two year terms on a rotating basis.)

The functions of the Committee as outlined in the *Federal Register* for July 3, 1965, are:

(1) Consider policies and problems relating to Federal libraries; (2) Evaluate existing Federal library programs and resources; (3) Determine priorities among library issues requiring attention; (4) Examine the organization and policies for acquiring, preserving, and making information available; (5) Study the need for and potential of technological innovation in library practices; (6) Study Library budgeting and staffing problems, including the recruiting, education, training, and remuneration of librarians.

Within these areas the Committee recommends actions to improve Federal library service through better utilization; more effective planning, development, and operation; and exchange of experience, skill, and resources.

As part of its responsibility, the Committee reviewed the report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries and in consequence adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the Federal Library Committee is organized for the purpose of considering policies and problems relating to Federal libraries and to recommend actions to improve Federal library service, and

Whereas the National Advisory Commission on Libraries has reported to the President of the United States and recommended actions for the improvement of library service in the United States, and

Whereas these recommendations, if implemented, will result in improvement of library service to the Federal Government and to the Nation generally: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Federal Library Committee does hereby endorse and support the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries:

> That it be declared National Policy, enunciated by the President and enacted into law by the Congress that the American people should be provided with library and information services adequate to their needs, and that the Federal Government, in collaboration with State and local governments and private agencies, should exercise leadership in assuring the provision of such services; and finally, be it

Resolved, That the Federal Library Committee endorses as a first step in implementing this policy the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science to report to the President and the Congress as a permanent Federal agency.

The operating agencies of the Federal Government are increasingly dependent upon information and information services. Each program which tends to strengthen and to coordinate such services tends to strengthen the Government itself. For this reason, the Federal Library Committee wishes to support the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science and would expect to work closely with the Commission in securing Federal library cooperation in its programs. In this respect, Federal libraries have much to contribute and much to gain.

The collections of Federal libraries constitute an important resource for providing information needed in daily operation of the Government, and in the conduct of agency research programs. Inter-library lending, inter-agency reference assistance, cooperative cataloging, literature searching, and other forms of cooperation are essential to full and efficient use of this resource.

Increasingly, a community of interest has developed among Federal and non-Federal library users. Federal libraries support those missions of their agencies that relate to non-Governmental groups by extending their library services to other libraries, research institutions, and the general public.

A National Commission will, in our opinion, assist the Federal Library Committee in achieving its objectives by including Federal libraries in its studies, surveys and analyses of the library and informational needs of the Nation. The Committee has, over a period of years, learned much about Federal library programs, policies and problems. Yet, there is much more to be done to gather the basic information upon which overall planning must be based. Although the Committee has had considerable success in helping to improve library service to the Government, it needs help in gathering such basic information as locating and listing all Federal libraries, determining the nature and amount of Federal library resources, determining nature of agency needs for library and information services. It also needs help in developing networks and cooperative programs among Federal libraries and between Federal libraries and other segments of the National library community.

It is our belief that the demands for library and information services are so great and so universal that we can no longer afford haphazard uncoordinated growth, but must develop cooperative programs that are national in scope and which include all types of libraries and information services. A National Commission is essential to such development.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Gaydos?

Mr. GAYDOS. I have no questions.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Mumford, I just have one other question to put to you, which in part anticipates some subsequent testimony. I think we are going to hear shortly from a witness who will recommend that some of the proposed authority for the National Commission to provide technical assistance and to encourage research and development be removed from the bill to leave the Commission principally as an advisory body, thus significantly limiting the authority that is proposed in the bill. Do you have any comment on that?

Mr. MUMFORD. I would view the primary role of the Commission as a planning and coordinating agency.

I think it should also be authorized to encourage and promote research as outlined in H.R. 8839. The Commission would not necessarily carry on the research itself, although it might well do some studies. As to the matter of technical assistance, I feel hardly qualified to comment on that. I think there might be occasions when it would be desirable for the Commission to have the authority to make a grant for a particular study that needed to be done and that no one else was undertaking.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, indeed, Mr. Mumford. We appreciate your appearing before us today.

Mr. MUMFORD. Thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Our next witness is Mr. Grant Venn, the Associate Commissioner of Education for Adult, Vocational, and Library Programs in the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Venn, we are very pleased to have you here this morning, and please go ahead.

STATEMENT OF GRANT VENN, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER FOR ADULT, VOCATIONAL, AND LIBRARY PROGRAMS, OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. VENN. I would like to read my statement.

I am pleased to appear today to testify on H.R. 8839, the proposed creation of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. This bill affirms the essential role of libraries in serving the Nation's educational needs. It enunciates a national policy of Federal cooperation with State and local governments and with public and private agencies to assure the best use of the Nation's libraries recognized by the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. This Commission subsequently recommended the "establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a continuing Federal planning agency."

Current needs of the American library community are many and diverse. From the postwar period to the present, a variety of legistive programs have been endorsed by the Congress to support libraries of all kinds: school, public, college, and research libraries. This recognition in recent decades that libraries represent a national education resource and, therefore, are appropriate recipients of Federal support follows a long tradition, dating back to 1800, of Federal support for the libraries of the Federal Establishment; a tradition reflected in the creation of some of the finest libraries in the world—the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, and others.

This record of Federal support for the Nation's libraries has been particularly crucial in a time of a dramatic increase in knowledge and materials: books, monographs, journals, and multimedia materials. Together with the expansion of library programs, many of them geared to newly identified clienteles such as the disadvantaged, the tremendous increase in recorded knowledge has led to serious administrative problems for libraries everywhere.

We feel that the proposed National Commission would serve a number of useful purposes directed toward alleviating the difficulties of libraries across the country. As it now stands, the bill would establish a National Commission carrying out a broad scope of functions: advisory, planning and evaluation, and operational. For reasons which I shall delineate, we would hope that, in operation, the Commission would strongly emphasize its advisory functions, as these appear to use to be most crucially needed.

First of all, I think it should be noted that a number of the Commission's functions proposed in H.R. 8839 are already being carried out by a range of Federal programs related to library needs. For example, the Commission would be directed to "promote research and development activities."

It is not clear precisely how the Commission would be expected to promote such activities without the resources to make contracts in support of research and development. However, even if the Commission had the resources, we wonder if it wouldn't merely represent another layer on top of existing research and development activities undertaken by the Office of Education, the National Library of

Medicine, the National Science Foundation, and other Federal agencies.

Research and development is also supported by State governments and by private foundations, such as the Council on Library Resources. Perhaps a more effective role for the Commission would be to coordinate ongoing research programs at the Federal, State, and local levels. The difficulty in expecting this Commission to carry out research activities can be dramatized by an example of the cost of research studies.

Recently, the Office of Education contributed to a research project designed to evaluate the utility of book and media examination centers for school librarians and school faculties. The first phase of a multiphase project is costing a total of $291,637, of which the Office of Education is providing $227,767—slightly less than one-half of the appropriation authorized for the Commission's operations. Therefore, promoting research, if that is to mean giving grants and contracts, would be far beyond the Commission's scope. At any rate, it would appear to mean a duplication of authority already in existence.

It should be noted, too, that the Commission's planning function may be a duplication of those now being carried out in the operation of various Federal library programs. Congress has already given the mandate to the Office of Education for its basic mission of promoting "the cause of education," which assuredly includes libraries. The conduct of studies and surveys, evaluation of programs, development of planning units, and provision of technical assistance are presently a part of the responsibilities of programs administered by the Office of Education and of the administration of major libraries supported entirely by the Federal Government, such as the Library of Congress and the National Library of Medicine. Limited funds have sometimes seriously restricted our ability to carry out these functions fully. Most executive agencies with major responsibilities for the support of libraries or information science have provided for planning components. I might add we have not been funded to do the kind of planning that I think is needed and envisioned by the existing legislation.

In view of this, we question the advisability of vesting in the proposed Commission major planning responsibilities, divorced as they would be from any power to execute the overall plans it might design. We feel that the Commission's involvement in planning, both in the area of program development and research, would best be oriented toward coordinating the planning now going on at Federal, State, and local levels, leaving to the Federal agencies and to the State and local levels specific authority to plan their own programs.

As it now stands, it appears that the Commission could find itself in the awkward position of evolving broad plans which would not only never be implemented, but would be totally divorced from the operating programs.

We are concerned, then, that some of the responsibilities proposed for the Commission might prove to be beyond its powers to implement, and would duplicate responsibilities presently vested in existing Federal and other programs. We feel that the Commission would be most usefully seen as a coordinating and advisory body, particularly as it would relate to operating Federal programs of library support. Of all the categories of responsibilities assigned by this bill to the proposed Commission, only the advisory and coordinating responsibilities for the total national program of support to libraries are not clearly provided for by existing legislation. Mention should be made of a number of existing library boards for single programs, such as exemplified in the Federal sphere by the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine. These would continue to provide special advisory services for particular programs. In the area of examining the total national library program, the National Commission would provide a mechanism to advise the President, the Secretary, and the Congress on policy questions affecting libraries and to work with agencies involved in library support to find avenues of close coordination among current library programs.

While stating our feelings about how the proposed Commission might be most useful in helping to meet the Nation's library and information science needs, we would like to raise the possibility that the very independence of the Commission as it is proposed here may hamper somewhat the Commission's ability to advise on and coordinate the manner in which library support resources are spent. The bill provides for an independent agency linked only for administrative purposes to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare where Federal programs for library support are concentrated. Since the Commission would have no substantive relationship to HEW or any other Government agency, its advice and recommendations might not be closely and productively related to the manner in which funds will actually be spent. At the very least, we feel that representatives from those agencies now charged with the administration of Federal library programs should be added to the Commission in an ex officio capacity.

These should include: (a) the Secretary of HEW or his designate; (b) a representative from one of the three national libraries: the Library of Congress, the National Agricultural Library, and the National Library of Medicine; and (c) a representative from one of the Federal councils most directly concerned with research and investigation in the field of information retrieval, such as the Federal Council for Science and Technology or the National Science Foundation.

Including representatives of these agencies in the work of the Commission as ex official members would insure that the views of the agencies responsible for Federal library programs would be considered, and the agencies would be in a better position to implement the Commission's recommendations.

Consistent with the policy of relieving the President of as much administrative detail as possible, we recommend that the Commission be appointed by the Secretary and be established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I would like to add one other suggestion regarding the Commission's composition. It would be useful for the Congress to spell out the criteria for the Commission's membership more specifically. We would recommend that the Commission's membership be defined to include persons:

(a) representative of each type of library including college and research, public, school, and special libraries, and the field of library education;

(b) knowledgeable of technological advances in the field of information retrieval;

(c) particularly responsive to socioeconomic trends, including urban and regional planners and personnel conversant with the needs of the culturally and educationally deprived;

(d) responsible for the administration of an educational program, such as a school or university; and

(e) knowledgeable of the entire field of communication.

In conclusion, we support the concept of a National Commission on Library and Information Science as an advisory body, although we do have reservations about the way it is designed in H.R. 8839. We feel that its broad functions would prove to be far beyond the Commission's working capacity, and that the Commission's work would most productively be focused on functions that are not now being performed by agencies administering library programs; that is, advisory and coordinating responsbilities directly related to implementation of programs.

We believe that the National Commission must be clearly defined as an advisory commission. In contrast to other advisory councils, such as the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, the National Commission's role, as presently defined in H.R. 8839, is ambiguous. The removal of the authority to provide technical assistance, section 5(a)(5), and to promote research and development activities, section 5(a)(6), would help to bring its role more nearly in line with the functions of an advisory body. We recognize its need for authority to sponsor some surveys and evaluations, but would hope that it would encourage and rely heavily upon the operating agencies to provide most of this data. These activities would be most meaningful when related to on-going programs.

These suggestions are given with the intent of strengthening the concept of a national advisory committee on libraries and information science, a concept which we feel should be reflected in the title of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

We hope that these changes, by clarifying and more specifically defining its role, would result in a practical arrangement for fortifying our vital library and information resources.

Thank you.

Mr. Brademas. Thank you very much, Mr. Venn. I am very pleased to be reassured, having heard your statement, that your suggestions are given with the intent of "strengthening" the concept of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

In view of the newspaper stories this morning, setting forth the text of President Nixon's program on domestic priorities, and considering the fact that the bill before us today comes, it is fair to say, within the overall rubic of education, I am moved to observe that in his entire listing of priorities for the American people President Nixon did not once mention education.

You ought to read that message. It is really quite illuminating and enlightening in that respect. I am therefore moved to harken back to one sentence from President Nixon's education task force report, the full text of which I inserted in the Congressional Record of March 12.

Said the Nixon Task Force on Education, and this is hardly a Democratic group:

> Speaking candidly, we do not believe that President Nixon with all his varied and high qualifications for office would at present, by most Americans, be considered to have the present concern for education the times require.

Now I couple that rather sharp observation on the part of his own counselors with the failure of President Nixon even to mention education, with the sole exception of the phrase, "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare," which somehow crept into his message.

I make these observations against the background of your own testimony here this morning.

As I understand what you are saying, Mr. Venn, you want to reduce the level of visibility and importance and stature of the proposed National Commission on Libraries and Information Science by making it part of another Department. You don't want the President to appoint its members.

You want to put it within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and have the Secretary appoint its members. You want to strip it of its capacity to engage in technical assistance activities. You want to destroy the possibility of its promoting research and development. You want to restrict its general area of activity by causing it to focus on those library programs which involve Federal support.

You conclude your statement with the phrase:

> These suggestions are given with the intent of strengthening the concept of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

I am almost back in the Alice in Wonderland world or the world of George Orwell where black is white and we talk about double speak. So I confess myself, not having seen your statement before this very minute this morning, somewhat surprised and somewhat distressed.

I am aware of the importance of doing something about inflation and curbing unwarranted expenditures, but here is an area where I thought we would have somewhat more encouragement from the administration than your statement represents. I offer these observations in no partisan sense. I am sure there will be opportunities where I can speak with much more partisan passion than I do this morning.

But the bill before you has very strong support from colleagues on both sides of the aisle, including the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Steiger, who has been an ardent advocate for this legislation. He will have to speak for himself, as will the other members of the subcommittee, but I do want to give voice to my own distress at the feebleness of the support of the administration in an area where it really isn't going to cost much money.

The prosecution rests. Would you like to say something?

Mr. VENN. The executive branch indicated that the Secretary should have the responsibility to appoint the members of the Commission and house it in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This was the wish of the administration in terms of the bill. We certainly didn't intend, Mr. Chairman, that these remarks imply a downgrading of the Commission.

I think that the essence of our approach in this matter is that the effectiveness of planning relates to how well the plans may be carried out. In suggesting membership for representatives of Federal agencies, we were attempting to bridge the gap between planning and implementation.

We recognize that there has not been any overall coordination of planning and research. We are not arguing that research and planning need not be done. We are arguing that they should be continued. We only hope that the work of the agencies would be related to the Commission so that its recommendations would be more effectively carried out.

Mr. Brademas. Thank you. Mr. Hansen?

Mr. Hansen. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me express my appreciation for your testimony which I have interpreted somewhat more hopefully than perhaps the chairman and will accept what have been constructive recommendations. My basic question is this, however, would the role of the Commission be limited more by the funding, for example, than by any specific limitations in the basic legislation?

Mr. Venn. Yes, sir, Mr. Hansen; I think this would be true. We did point out that the amount to be appropriated would probably not allow for extensive evaluation and study. Since the suggested appropriations were limited, we said that the Commission should provide a coordinating role with the agencies. Of all the proposed assignments for the Commission, the one which would be most important would be that of coordinating agency responsibilities which have already been enacted by statute. This area of concentration would be most effective in terms of producing results.

Mr. Hansen. If the coordinating advisory function is carried out effectively, then this I would assume would act as some kind of a restraint on the Commission's engaging in activities that would be duplication of function of other agencies.

Mr. Venn. Yes, sir; I think it would.

Mr. Hansen. Also in the area of research and development, if the amendment proposed by Mr. Mumford could be incorporated into the bill, the amendment which would grant authority to receive gifts, to carry on the work of the Commission, and if a grant or gift were made for the purpose of a specific well-defined research project which did not duplicate the research already going on, is there any reason why this Commission should not undertake such specific research projects with those resources?

Mr. Venn. No; I do not see that this would be restrictive as long as the opportunities of input from the agencies already involved could be brought to bear on it directly, so that it did fill in gaps and vacuums rather than duplicate.

Mr. Hansen. Thank you very much.

Mr. Brademas. Mr. Meeds?

Mr. Meeds. Mr. Venn, I assume that research and development being done by presently existing agencies would continue, but do you know of any one single agency or one single commission which could carry out the broad-based resource development and research which is envisioned by this group?

Mr. Venn. No, sir; I don't think there is an agency which has the overall authority that is defined in this bill.

Mr. Meeds. So if we want to tie those things together in a coordinating research and overall planning area, we would need this research development function which is provided in 5(a)(6), would we not?

Mr. Venn. I think the efforts for coordinating research would be needed. The Office of Education Bureau of Research presently allots $3 million within their library research program. We would assume that such a program would continue within areas of research as may be identified by the proposed Commission.

Mr. Meeds. After the research is done by individual agencies, and I probably agree with you that in many instances this could be done for less money and perhaps even with greater accuracy, somehow that is all going to have to be tied together in a system of national priorities, is it not?

Mr. Venn. Yes; we are aware of the large number of libraries and of their varied types: school, college, and public. We know that all of these libraries conduct many projects, and there is a need to effectuate closer ties of cooperation among them. Our concern is that a plan set by a national commission could not be implemented unless some mechanism links the commission to the operating agencies responsible for assisting these libraries.

Mr. Meeds. It would seem to me the section 5(a)(6) would go a long way toward bridging that gap of which you speak.

Now by the same token, again assuming the same thing for instance, in the area of information retrieval, the Medical Libraries Commission could best devise some system for retrieval for medical libraries, and school libraries could best devise a system for school libraries.

Aren't we again faced with the necessity to integrate this in many areas and to tie this type of information retrieval planning together at a higher level somewhere so that we have an integrated system perhaps?

Mr. Venn. All of our efforts should be integrated. I would hope that the Commission could serve as the integrating force and make specific recommendations to the agency responsible for library development. Such recommendations can be forwarded to the President and Congress. The national overview is necessary, since all of us recognize that each specialization, whether it be school librarianship or any other, needs to be coordinated in the national interest.

Mr. Meeds. Do you think that the Library Commission, as proposed here, could make that input without any ability to provide technical assistance itself in the overall planning? Let's face it, you are getting input from all the various agencies and bureaus and groups and libraries and schools. How do you tie it all together?

Mr. Venn. It would be difficult for a national commission to direct an overall plan without ties to the responsible agencies. The Commission's recommendations should be injected into the work of the agencies. Already many technicians are in the field carrying out consultative functions. Their work must be continued and should be more closely related to the Commission.

Mr. Meeds. Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I think I will observe we are back in the old fight of whether we need an Office of Economic Opportunity to coordinate and put a primary function of focus on the problems of poverty. There are existing agencies that have been looking at poverty for years and years and until the Office of Economic Opportunity came along and took as a primary function, the obliteration of the totality of poverty, we never made any substantial gains.

Thank you.

Mr. Brademas. Mr. Steiger?

Mr. Steiger. I am a little hesitant to follow that one. I will bypass that last comment, which I do not think is relevant to what we are talking about.

Mr. Venn, I will say to you that your statement is helpful in giving us some view of what the administration feels regarding this question. There are points with which I frankly disagree and there are points on which I do agree. As you are aware, while I am a cosponsor of this bill, H.R. 8839, I also had introduced this separate bill, H.R. 908.

In H.R. 908, the Commission is a part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, rather than separate. Thus, I do support your position on that question.

I think it more appropriately belongs in HEW. I disagree that the Secretary, however, ought to make the appointments. With all due respect to Mr. Finch, the Secretary, I think the status of the Commission—its role—would be strengthened if it is a presidential commission, and thus I for one will not help you on trying to make the Secretary's job even harder by giving him those extra appointments to make.

I wonder if you can clarify for me the question that has been tossed around here as to just what is the role of the Commission. I am not sure that I fully comprehend what you foresee as its purpose in being established.

You agree it ought to be established, you support the concept, and it is at that point that we break down as to just where it is that the Commission ought to go. Can you give to me some résumé of the points in section 5(a) of H.R. 8839 with which you would disagree or which you feel ought to be changed, and then let me ask you whether there are points in section 3(b) of H.R. 908 that you think more appropriate or less appropriate, as contrasted to the bill now before us.

Mr. VENN. That is a large question. Let me attempt to respond, Mr. Steiger, to the overall concept of the Commission. We do not question at all that there is a great need for an overall look at the programs. I think the question that we are raising is whether or not the Commission's role is primarily advising and coordinating or is the Commission's role operational in terms of carrying out, conducting, and administering programs of its own.

Mr. STEIGER. If I can interrupt you, you really don't see the Commission, do you, as a coordinating body? Is that either a role that it can effectively carry out on a part-time basis, even with a staff, and a limited budget?

Mr. VENN. There should be representation on this Commission from other agencies of the Federal Government. The Commission would be independent to make its own recommendations. Representatives from other agencies could bring to this Commission information on the research that they are doing, the Commission, being independent—and I imagine more objective than some of us would be about our own programs—could then take a look and indicate an area in which there is a gap or an area in which we need additional study. The Commission could then report back to these agencies that they consider the recommendations in the context of their program. I think this would be a better approach than to develop a large operational set of technicians and special within the Commission.

Mr. STEIGER. I understand that. But that doesn't answer my question on the coordination. Is that really a role it can play?

Mr. VENN. In terms of the Commission actually administering and assigning functions to the operating agencies this could not be done in terms of authorizations already written into law and now in effect.

Mr. Steiger. It can play an evaluation role, however?

Mr. Venn. I think it could make judgments and make recommendations and I think the agencies involved would be most happy to have this input and would be anxious to carry it out.

Mr. Steiger. To go on to what specific items in either of the bills before this subcommittee will pose problems, can you come back to us with comments along that line, if you cannot make them now?

Mr. Venn. I would prefer to submit the additional comments to this question for the record.

Mr. Brademas. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The information referred to follows:)

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education

COMMENTS ON THE COMMISSION'S ROLE AS DESCRIBED IN H.R. 8839 (SEC. 5(a)) VERSUS H.R. 908 (SEC. 3(b))

On the whole, the Department favors the provisions of H.R. 908, Sec. 3(b), over those of H.R. 8839, Sec. 5(a). We feel that the role assigned to the Commission by H.R. 908 would be the more realistic one, in terms of the Commission's size and resources, and in terms of the Nation's library and information needs.

H.R. 8839 situates the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science in HEW for administrative purposes only. H.R. 908 places the Commission in HEW. We feel that this would be wiser, since it would encourage a more direct relationship between the work and recommendations of the Commission and HEW's extensive involvement in the administration of Federal aid programs to school, public, and academic libraries.

H.R. 8839 subsumes responsibilities for overall planning for "meeting national library and informational needs and for the coordination of activities at the Federal, State, and local levels * * *" under the aegis of the Commission. H.R. 908 does not vest the Commission with overall planning authority; it recommends that the Commission "encourage better coordination of activities to improve administration of such laws at the Federal, State, and local levels * * *." We prefer the language in H.R. 908, because it asserts the Commission's role as a coordinator, rather than an instigator, of planning activities. Since the Commission would not have regulatory powers, its role could only be that of an advisory and coordinating body, and H.R. 809 reflects this principle.

In line with its view of the Commission as a coordinating mechanism, H.R. 908 further directs that the National Commission "recommend methods of support and coordination of activities, taking into consideration Federal agencies concerned with service and research in the field of libraries and information science." H.R. 8839 has no comparable provision. We favor the inclusion of such a provision.

Both bills provide for research functions for the Commission, and although we favor language making it clear that the Commission would not be conducting research projects itself, we prefer the H.R. 908 provision. Difference in the wording of the two bills is subtle here, but it should be noted that H.R. 908 recommends only that "opportunities for research" be promoted, while H.R. 8839 directs the Commission to "promote research * * * " Since the Commission would not have the resources to conduct research, H.R. 908 more clearly implies that the Commission would not be expected to do so, and therefore we prefer its wording.

H.R. 8839 makes no specific mention of the disadvantaged, a clientele of libraries too frequently overlooked. On the other hand, Sec. 3(b)(4) of H.R. 908 directs the Commission to encourage the development of programs to meet the special library and information needs of the disadvantaged. We agree that special mention should be made of this need.

H.R. 8839 permits the Commission to provide "technical assistance" to agencies at all levels, including those of the private sector. We prefer H.R. 908's exclusion of this authority, because major technical assistance responsibilities are directly related to operating programs within the Federal Government and to existing National libraries. Therefore, we do not see the assignment of technical assistance authority to the Commission as necessary.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Gaydos?

Mr. GAYDOS. I have no questions.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Landgrebe?

Mr. LANDGREBE. I have no questions.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much.

The Chair would like to observe that it is close to a quarter past 11. We have two more distinguished witnesses. I would like to suggest, if it is agreeable to them, that they both come forward at this time, each of them give his statement as he wishes to do so and then members of the subcommittee can put questions to which both of them may wish to respond.

The two witnesses next are Dr. Frederick Burkhardt, the president of the American Council of Learned Societies; and Dr. Herman Wells, the chancellor of Indiana University. We are very pleased, indeed, to have both of these distinguished American educators come before us today.

The Chair is especially pleased to see here his old friend Chancellor Wells who gave such superb service to our Task Force on International Education in 1966.

I would like to suggest, Dr. Burkhardt, that you go ahead and make a statement and then Chancellor Wells, if you would like to make your statement, we will be pleased to put questions to you both.

STATEMENT OF FREDERICK BURKHARDT, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

Dr. BURKHARDT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think with your permission, I could probably save time by just having my written statement put into the record.

I will simply excerpt and then comment on Mr. Venn's testimony, if I may.

(Mr. Burkhardt's statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF FREDERICK BURKHARDT, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I should like to begin by expressing my thanks to the Subcommittee for affording me the privilege and opportunity of testifying before it.

My name is Frederick Burkhardt and I am President of the American Council of Learned Societies, a federation of thirty-three national learned societies in the humanities and social sciences. During 1967 and 1968 I had the honor to serve as Vice Chairman of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, appointed by President Johnson. The Advisory Commission was charged with making a comprehensive study of the role of libraries and their needs; it sought to appraise the programs and policies of public and private agencies concerned with the library and information needs of the nation and to develop recommendations for action by government and private institutions to ensure an effective national library system.

The Report of this Commission, called "Library Services for the Nation's Needs: Toward Fulfillment of a National Policy," was submitted in July 1968 and was published in the *Congressional Record* on October 14, 1968.

That Report provides clear evidence that we are faced with a great information crisis: a crisis caused on the one hand by the almost incredible growth in the amount of knowledge being discovered and published—what journalists have called the knowledge explosion—and on the other hand by the need for more advanced levels of information and knowledge by the citizens of this modern, complex technological civilization. It is the job of our libraries and other information services to make the accumulated knowledge available to the teachers and students in our schools and colleges and to those who need it in government and business. They are the vital link in the transfer of knowledge already acquired to those who must have it for solving the problems of the present and the future.

Our Commission found problems of great magnitude in the knowledge transmission system of our country. There are large segments of our public that do not have access to even minimal library collections and services, and in communities with adequate facilities the libraries are burdened with increasingly heavy demands by users. Almost all of them are deficient in funds and manpower and hard put to keep their collections and services up to date. At every level of education there are serious deficiencies in library resources and services, and even at our best institutions the problems of collecting and cataloguing, of space and funding, are enormous. Technological innovations in the storage and retrieval of information hold great promise, but on the whole they have not yet been fully developed to solve the problems of bibliographical and physical access to the materials needed for instruction and research. Networks of knowledge on the local, state, and regional levels are still in a primitive stage and very expensive to develop and operate; standards that would make the diversity of systems compatible are lacking.

In short, the library and information needs of the nation are so large and critical that a national effort will be needed—an effort that will have to come from both the private and public sectors, on the local, state, and federal levels.

For this reason the National Advisory Commission on Libraries recommended to the President that it be declared national policy that the American people should be provided with library and information services adequate to their needs and that the federal government, in collaboration with state and local governments, should exercise leadership assuring the provision of such services.

A national library policy requires that a national library program should be worked out. Such a program should, our Commission Report stated, have six broad and fundamental objectives:

1. To provide adequate library and information services for formal education at all levels.
2. To provide adequate library and information services for the public at large.
3. To provide materials to support research in all fields at all levels.
4. To provide adequate bibliographical access to the nation's research and information resources.
5. To provide adequate physical access to required materials or their texts throughout the nation.
6. To provide adequate trained personnel for the varied and changing demands of librarianship.

"These are the six areas," our Commission said, "where current inadequacies exist, and future inadequacies are foreseen unless all participants in the management and use of information can look to coherent national planning and coordinated research and development."

The Commission became convinced early in its work that a fundamental step in implementing such a national program would be the establishment of a continuing National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. In almost all of our hearings and in many of the studies made for us a high priority was given to the creation of such a federal planning body.

The continuing Commission proposed by H.R. 8839 is a first, essential step in the provision of a coordinated national plan.

What, specifically, would such a Commission do?

In the first place, the proposed Commission would have to conduct studies and research that would provide accurate and current data on the library needs of the nation. Our Advisory Commission found that in almost every area of the library field, while there was clear evidence of large scale problems and needs, there was also a dearth of the hard facts needed for realistic planning.

Second, the Commission would be charged with coordination of the diverse and extensive library and information programs of the various federal agencies. No one knows precisely how much money the federal government is now spending on these programs, and because each agency has its own mission and objectives both duplication and gaps in the overall effort are inevitable. Nothing resembling a consistent coordinated federal library program now exists. The proposed Commission would fill an important need by providing a central planning body for such a federal program, which would establish priorities, eliminate duplication, and make recommendations for filling the gaps and anticipating the needs of the future.

Third, we need not only better data and a coordinated federal program for library support, we also need an agency to promote research and development activities which will improve and expand the national capability for information transmission and use. Although the realization of the dream of instant access to all information is still very remote indeed, there is a rich potential in current technology for the improvement of our information system. Research and development of software and hardware specifically designed for efficient library and information service are urgently needed. The National Commission could play an important part in the stimulation and support of such efforts.

Fourth, the Commission and its staff should be in a position to provide both government and private agencies, institutions, and groups with advice with respect to the library and information needs of the nation.

Finally, the proposed Commission should not only report each year to the President and Congress on its activities, but should be empowered to propose new legislation to meet the needs which it finds as a result of its studies and its planning activities.

As H.R. 8839 makes clear, the new Commission should be a planning body, not an operating agency. It should not replace any of the present operational programs or have responsibility for any new ones. Nor should it take over the planning which each agency must do to carry out its specific mission. Rather its objective should be to see to it that the diverse programs become effective and integrated parts of a coordinated over-all plan. If it is to do this, the proposed Commission should not be subordinate or allied to any of the present agencies, but should be independent of them all and of service to them all.

The Commission membership should include librarians and information specialists, but a majority of its members should be persons who can competently represent the user interests and needs of the whole society. In this connection I should say that the present bill, in its obvious intent to protect against dominance by specialists and special interests, perhaps goes too far when it states that "Not more than five members of the Commission shall be professional librarians or information specialists. . . ." This stipulation could be fulfilled by the appointment of one person or even zero representation. Since such members will be essential to an effective Commission I suggest that the phrase "Not more than" be striken from the text and that the number of librarians and information specialists be set specifically at five.

The staff of the new Commission can be relatively small, but it must encompass experts in librarianship, education, the humanities, and the social and natural sciences. The modern library is far more than a collection of books and periodicals; the needs of its users range from recreation, through instruction, to research—and each of these needs requires materials and techniques specifically adapted to it. The National Commission must be competent to plan for the ghetto and suburb, for the scientist and the humanistic scholar—taking into account their different kinds of library needs. The staff of the Commission will be planning the library and information system of the future. To do this it will have to decide which specialized studies are required and contract for them. It will have to initiate research, evaluate present programs, and provide advice to institutions and groups with diverse and particularized needs. So its staff members will have to have a broad range of capability in regular service, with the power to augment their strength by enlisting *ad hoc* expert consultants for specific problems and programs.

The level of funding ($500,000) proposed in the bill is approximately the same amount as the National Advisory Commission on Libraries actually used for its meetings, staff salaries, and the dozen or so studies it contracted for during its tenure. Based on this experience I think a good start could be made with the amount proposed for the first year of the new Commission's activities.

I am sure that no one is under the illusion that the establishment of this Commission will in itself be a solution to the library and information problems of the nation. But it is a first step, and a necessary one. The National Advisory Commission considered it to be the most important single step that the federal government could take to demonstrate that it is national policy to respond to the country's library and information needs. It is a step that can lead to a national program for dealing with those needs and provide a coordinated, consistent plan for library support by the federal government. It is clear that the problems are complex and the needs are large. If we are to cope with them within the resources available to us, a comprehensive long-range plan must be worked out, priorities set, and guidance provided. The establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science will be a historic beginning of a venture which will contribute to the fuller utilization and advancement of knowledge that the times demand.

Dr. **Burkhardt.** As I have said here, I had the honor to be a member and Vice President of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, which worked for a little over a year in trying to get the picture of what was needed in this country so far as its library services and information services are concerned. We came out with a very definite feeling of a great informational crisis in this country, partly due to the fact that what the journalists call a knowledge explosion has taken place, the amount of published literature, and unpublished informational data is tremendous, and keeping up with this and utilizing it for the advancement of knowledge for the training of people is a terrible problem.

On the other hand, we have got a vast increase in the need for knowledge and in the higher and higher stages of education needed by people in order to be citizens and to be effective productive members of this highly complex technological society.

In the middle is the so-called knowledge transmission system that the libraries and the information services provide. That system is not now able to cope with both the explosion and the demand and very great measures are going to have to be taken, which will require resources that exceed those resources of the Federal Government and the State and local governments.

It's going to have to be a product of cooperation of every agency we can get, private and public. Now the conclusion we came to is that there must be some kind of rationalized library program for this country.

That means not only a program for the Federal Goverment's library efforts, which are large and very effective as far as they go, but spread out among different agencies with different missions, which are doing the best they can to fulfill those missions, and inevitably there are gaps because the directives and objectives of each particular agency are their primary concern.

What we also need is an establishment of priorities so that we can utilize the resources we have to the best advantage. We came to the conclusion that the first and most important step in dealing with this problem would be the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Sciences that would be continued.

What this Commission would do would be, in the first place, to work on such a coordinated program for the Federal Government and for the Nation as a whole, to establish what priorities there are, to establish what gaps there are in our knowledge. One of the most depressing things to me as a member of the Commission was what we found in these specialized studies, specialized studies done by various agencies, of which we commissioned about 14 or so. They had to use the data that was available now and the data that is available now is on the whole totally inadequate to make realistic plans.

We have got to get up-to-date library statistics, we have got to get the data we need on manpower and manpower training, we have got to get the data on what are the technological problems that have to be solved before libraries can really be effectively and efficiently and, above all, economically automated.

There are dozens of problems of this sort that are not now being located, or focused on, and I think this proposed Library Commission will be in a position to keep up with the rapid changes in the situation and also locate where the priorities and the needs are.

I think the most important single step to take now is to establish this Commission. We need some kind of planning and setting of priorities and some kind of realistic solutions to the problems that beset our libraries and the people who use them.

To get down to particular points as to what this Commission would be doing, I would like to refer to Mr. Venn's testimony.

I think Mr. Venn has the national and legitimate concerns of an operating agency that is doing its work and he perhaps sees this Commission as diluting or duplicating the work which the present agencies are doing.

If so, I believe he misunderstands the function of this Commission. This will be a great help to the present operating agencies. I do not see it as an operating agency in itself. I see it as primarily making a plan which will, because it will be a consistent plan, coordinate the efforts of the Federal agencies and the private agencies that are interested in supporting library work, so they fit together and are responsive to the priorities and the resources available.

I think it will help the present agencies in their operational planning. I don't think this Commission should engage in duplicating the planning of each specific agency. But, as I pointed out in the education area, the planning that goes on now is done with the specific objectives of that agency in mind.

There are gaps in that. There are things that are needed. This Commission can point this out. It can call for studies that are not now being done.

In the promotion of research and development I again don't see it as an agency which will set up a body of technical experts that would develop machinery and programs. It will point out the needs and stimulate research and development by making the case for the kinds of technological investigation that should be carried out.

There is a great need, we have discovered, for programing and even for hardware to produce systems that will make the computer and computer technology actually usable and efficient for libraries.

Although there are many agencies concerned with technological research and development, the actual combination of things that are needed to make the information system work, overall, not only for libraries and humanists doing research with books, but for scientists having to keep up with periodical literature and abstracts, still presents definite technical problems.

This Commission, in locating them, in working them into a plan, would be able to make a great contribution in stimulating research and development, not doing it itself.

Mr. Venn commented on the nature of the Commission and where it should be. Our advisory commission spent a good deal of time in thinking where this permanent commission should be located. We ended by suggesting that it might be in the Office of the Secretary of

Health, Education, and Welfare. This was a practical decision, I think, at the time.

I don't know whether the practical conditions still exist. But what is really needed is independence of any of the agencies and the establishment of this Commission as an independent agency would be ideal.

Some people felt that an independent agency would be weakened by being off and out of any particular agency. I think the Congress will know best about where it should be located. But the important thing is that it must be independent of any particular operating agency or any particular ongoing program. Otherwise, it won't have the autonomy and the freedom to make recommendations for an overall Federal program.

If this can be done by placing it in the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, well and good. But ideally its independence and autonomy is best preserved by having it as a separate agency.

As for the membership, I disagree with Mr. Venn in that I don't think ex officio representation from the present agencies is necessary. This Commission will have to work very closely with the ongoing agencies and if it does not take steps to be in constant touch and to know what is going on, it will not be doing its full job.

I think a good Commission will naturally be consulting all of the executive agencies that have programs in the library and information field. But, if they have ex officio membership, you are going to get too large a Commission which will spend time on each particular agency and its particular interests, whereas this Commission ought to have a large perspective overlooking all of them and be independent of them.

The same goes for Mr. Venn's designation of the membership. He has one representative of this and one representative of that, and one representative of another thing. If you follow that pattern you are going to get a congerie of special interests, each of which will be trying to advance quite naturally and legitimately its own particular little and important, often, part of this enterprise.

This Commission has got to be made up of men and women with large perspectives, who represent the great user needs of this Nation as a whole and not of any particular agency or association that is concerned with one or another part of this. It should be a fairly small, working Commission meeting regularly. It should not be a forum for making cases for this or that interest every time it meets.

So for these reasons, I disagree with Mr. Venn on his notions of how this Commission should be constituted.

As I said before, I don't see it as operating in research and development, if by that is meant actually doing the research and developing its applications. As for technical assistance and advice, I don't have the worry that Mr. Venn has. I think this Commission will have in its possession, as it works, a good deal of technical advice and assistance to give.

I see it as having studies made which will be in the form of good solid concrete advice to have ready for the various users that will need such advice. It will be a clearinghouse for a great deal of information on libraries and their needs.

It seems to me inevitable that it should be given power to give such technical asistance and advice as part of its normal function.

I subscribe to Mr. Mumford's amendment that the Commission should be allowed to receive gifts from private sources, because I think that will enable it to have some flexibility to get programs going which it might not have the power to do within its present budget. So I think that is a good amendment.

Generally speaking, as I said in my testimony, on the basis of our experience with the National Advisory Committee, the amounts of money specified for it will, I think, be sufficient for this Commission to work in the way the legislation specifies.

I think it should be a small agency, it will be a help to the present agencies already in the Government. I don't see an empire being built here at all.

I am very glad to find that this legislation comes from both sides of the House and Senate. I think it is a very commendable step forward. I think it will be a historic step if it is implemented and carried out.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much.

Chancellor Wells?

STATEMENT OF HERMAN WELLS, CHANCELLOR, UNIVERSITY OF INDIANA

Dr. WELLS. Although my statement is very short, I am going to skip most of it and just make reference to it, because some of the principal points have already been covered.

I, of course, as you know, speak here as one who has had long experience with the problem of meeting the library needs of a great research library. The problem is finding a set of priorities which could help us do our share of meeting the nationall need and our share of furnishing a base for the knowledge industry, which is one of our principal industries in this Nation at the moment.

In other words, I speak as an operating man from the great State of Indiana. I think I might be permitted to say that in this company. I speak from that standpoint rather than from the standpoint of what goes on here in Washington.

I have in my testimony, short though it is, referred to the knowledge explosion and what that is doing to the amount of material to be handled. I have spoken of the explosion of research requirements. This is something which, I think, must be remembered.

I sometimes am associated with the great vacuum in materials in the international field to meet the needs of our American institutions dealing with the problems of America's new role in the world and our relationships to other nations. But I am no less concerned with the problems that have arisen from everyday new problems at home.

I am not a lawyer, any more than I am a librarian. But I did come from the middle part of the State where we have a lot of problems with drainage. I know there is a lot of material in our law library on drainage problems. I am perfectly certain that there is less material in our law library now on the critical problems of poverty law, the law that relates to the difficulties of the very poor.

This is just an illustration of a new topic coming up that creates new needs and puts great strain on the administrator to find resources for the research library. My statement includes statistics about the dramatic increase in the amount of publication, and even more dramatic statistics on the increasing prices.

I would like to put my entire short statement in the record.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Without objection, so ordered.

(Dr. Wells's statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF HERMAN B WELLS, CHANCELLOR, INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, my name is Herman B. Wells. I am Chancellor of Indiana University and President of the Indiana University Foundation. For twenty-five years, [illegible] to [illegible], I was President of Indiana University. I have been a member of the board of directors of the Council on Library Resources since its establishment in [illegible]. For more than thirty-five years I have been acutely aware of the importance of libraries to the university and research community. I also have been actively concerned with the numerous problems confronting research and university libraries as they seek to support the growing and complex informational needs of the Nation's research and scholarly community.

The critical problems of the Nations university and research libraries are twofold: (1) These libraries must acquire more and more material to serve an ever-increasing number of users with highly diversified and sophisticated needs. (2) The materials acquired must be organized and serviced in such a manner that their existence and relevance will be known and made available to those who need them.

The phenomenal increase in the world publication rate and the opening of major new areas of study and investigation have dictated ever-expanding acquisitions programs for our research libraries.

The inflationary prices of library materials coupled with the scope of material required has strained the limited financial resources of the institutions that support research libraries.

The significance of the rising cost of library materials is of prime importance and is of national concern for education and research.

In comparison to industries such as steel, construction, or chemical, publishing is limited. However, its expansion during the last few years has been substantial. Estimated world book production by number of titles for [illegible], according to the *Unesco Statistical Yearbook*, [illegible], are as follows:

[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]

According to the *Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*, U.S. price indexes for hardcover and technical books increased from a 1957-59 index of 100 to an index of [illegible] during the decade ending in [illegible]. During the same period paperback trade books increased from an index of 100 to [illegible]. Similar trends in index rises and price ratios are noticed in such European countries as France, Germany and Switzerland, but are much higher in the Far Eastern and Latin American countries. The average price of the above-mentioned library material increased per title from [illegible] in 1957-59 to [illegible] in [illegible], an increase of [illegible].

Exact statistics to support the tremendous publications boom in serials are impossible to find, presumably because serial publications are growing so fast. However, library literature abounds in estimates. Estimates of total periodical titles on the market range from [illegible] to [illegible]. An estimate of total serial titles (including periodicals and continuations) would probably be double the periodical estimate. Since it has been estimated that [illegible] new periodical titles appear each year, the total of new serials—periodicals and continuations—appearing each year would probably be [illegible].

Statistics on serial price increases are much better documented. Each year since [illegible] an annual article entitled "Price Indexes" has appeared in *The Library*

Journal. According to these articles the average increase in the cost of American periodicals from 1957 to 1967 was 83 percent, with the annual percentage increase consistently rising. (1966 increase was 9%.). Book prices of American books increased 57 percent in the same period. The result of these large yearly price increases is that budgets for serials and monographs have to be large and liberally augmented each year because of the increasing prices and the increased demand for library materials.

The acquisition of materials in increasing volume by research libraries creates service problems of magnitude. The libraries must record this vast accumulation of material in a meaningful manner so that it is known and readily available to users. This work of organizing materials for use grows in complexity and cost with every new item added to the research collection. Improved methods must be employed to speed the process of indexing, cataloging, abstracting and evaluating the contents of the thousands of new publications annually acquired by research libraries.

The application of electronic equipment to the service problems of our research libraries is widespread both on an experimental and operating basis. There are, however, serious deficiencies in the experiments now underway and in the systems now used to store and retrieve information. There is an overlapping of effort and tremendous gaps in coverage. Input costs when multiplied by millions of items, as with research collections, reach astronomical heights. No one library can absorb such costs. Also, trained and knowledgeable personnel with backgrounds to know library procedures and machine capabilities are in very short supply and should not be squandered in an unnecessary duplication. Our major need at this time is for standardization of machinery and the structuring of procedures and techniques. Without national effort, talents and resources will continue to be wasted in duplication of programs and experimentation.

If research libraries are to continue to serve the research community, a systematic and comprehensive national program must be developed that will insure that this country has the research resources required for its informational needs. A national program must also involve a more systematic and comprehensive funding procedure to assist research libraries in the acquisition and servicing of materials.

It is clear, therefore, that all research libraries, as well as all of the other libraries with which they cooperate, will benefit from the establishment of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science since it could develop the comprehensive, systematic and coordinated national program which is essential if the information needs of the Nation's citizens are to be met.

I urge, therefore, the enactment of [illegible].

Dr. [illegible]. I will just read the last four paragraphs, because they say precisely what I want to say.

The acquisition of materials in increasing volume by research libraries creates service problems of magnitude. The libraries must record this vast accumulation of material in a meaningful manner so that it is known and readily available to users. This work of organizing materials for use grows in complexity and cost with every new item added to the research collection. Improved methods must be employed to speed the process of indexing, cataloging, abstracting and evaluating the contents of the thousands of new publications annually acquired by research libraries.

The application of electronic equipment to the service problems of our research libraries is widespread both on an experimental and operating basis. There are, however, serious deficiencies in the experiments now underway and in the systems now used to store and retrieve information. There is an overlapping of effort and tremendous gaps in coverage. Input costs, when multiplied by millions of items, as with research collections, reach astronomical heights.

No one library can absorb such costs. Also, trained and knowledgeable personnel with backgrounds to know library procedures and machine capabilities are in very short supply and should not be squandered to do unnecessary duplication. Our major need at this time is for standardization of machinery and the structuring of procedures and techniques. Without national effort, talents and resources will continue to be wasted in duplication of programs and experimentation.

If research libraries are to continue to serve the research community, a systematic and comprehensive national program must be developed that will insure that this country has the research resources required for its informational needs. A national program must also involve a more systematic and comprehensive funding procedure to assist research libraries in the acquisition and servicing of materials.

It is clear, therefore, that all research libraries, as well as all of the other libraries with which they cooperate, will benefit from the establishment of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science since it could develop the comprehensive, systematic and coordinated national program which is essential if the information needs of the Nation's citizens are to be met.

I urge, therefore, the enactment of H.R. 8839.

We desperately need a national strategy for the library development in support of our knowledge industry. This bill would help us to achieve that national strategy, to formulate such a strategy and I urge indeed the enactment of this bill.

Mr. Brademas. Thank you very much. I just have two or three questions.

I was struck in the last part of your testimony by your observation on the enormous increase in the cost of maintaining research libraries and the fact that we haven't really done an effective job in standardizing machinery for acquiring and, I take it, cataloging such materials. Can you make any overall comment on what kinds of trends are going on in the United States right now?

I address this to either of you. I am especially referring to the field of research libraries at the university level, and I have in mind the need to ease some of the financial pressures on colleges and universities.

My memory is that some years ago the Southern Regional Educational Board developed a program whereby some universities would specialize in certain subject matter areas, especially at the graduate level, and others would specialize in other areas.

That is one part of my question. What kinds of coordination and planning are now going on to achieve that objective?

Second, what kind of headway are we making in terms of developing common computer languages for cataloging so as to ease the cost to the users and to provide readier access to library materials on the part of users?

Dr. Wells. Of course, we are attempting wherever we can to differentiate responsibilities. One of the dramatic illustrations of this is the Council on International Institutional Cooperation of the Big Ten universities and the University of Chicago, where a variety of specialized fields have been assigned to one, two, three, or four institutions within the group and the others utilize those institutions both for teaching and library resources, and so on.

I could give you many illustrations of this. There are instances in which groups of institutions form cluster colleges, so to speak, in order to share resources. This helps.

But such a bill as this, and such a Commission as this could highlight the results that can be achieved by this kind of thing in a way which the group itself cannot do.

It isn't perhaps quite so polite to blow one's own horn as to have somebody else objectively, from the outside, evaluate and say, this is good. So this is one thing I would say.

In the computerization field, I think one of the most promising and effective developments is the program which the Library of Congress has already entered into and which Mr. Mumford described.

This, of course, is a dramatic thing, but it needs to go much further.

Dr. **Burkhardt.** The MARC II program in the Library of Congress is a very, very good step forward as is their shared cataloging program. Mr. Mumford can tell you about that much better than I can.

Also, there is the problem of dealing with space requirements. You probably have heard of the Midwest Library Center, which is a place where they store copies of little-used material so that there will be one centralized storage library on which the various member libraries can draw and this saves the space of keeping books and materials there that are very rarely used, but which are used from time to time.

There the pressure of instant communication is not great and a centralized regional or even national storage library becomes a distinct possibility and a step toward greater efficiency, and we will save a lot of space.

Dr. **Wells.** I have said in the beginning of my statement that I have been concerned about this for a long time. I served on a committee that undertook to start that center some years ago.

Mr. **Brademas.** It is my understanding that both of you feel that in respect to both the efficient use of scarce moneys to acquire library materials and in terms of more efficiently cataloging such materials, that the existence of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science could make really substantial contributions in terms of coordination and leadership.

My question is rhetorical, but do I understand this is one with which you would not disagree?

Dr. **Wells.** I certainly agree. I think, actually, that one of the great services which this Commission could perform would be to help to highlight and dramatize nationally this need.

You know, books can speak powerfully if anybody will read them, but they are an inert thing. They don't have children that have to be fed every day; in a university, they have to fight for a priority against salaries, and against other kinds of educational materials. Actually our need for the knowledge industry, our need for research materials has grown so rapidly that there hasn't been an effective national voice speaking for this need. A national voice could help to enlist and increase the concern of donors, of State legislatures, of all parties that help to supply this need.

Mr. **Brademas.** I will just make one other observation before calling on the colleague from Indiana, but the impression I have as I listened to the testimony of both of you gentlemen and Mr. Mumford, as distinguished from the testimony of Mr. Venn, and I say this as objectively as I can, and I believe you addressed yourself to this point, Dr. Burkhardt, is that his testimony has a far different conception of what this National Commission is all about, a much more restrictive conception. I understand his justification for his attitude toward it, but he does have a much more narrow and restrictive concept.

On the other hand, the three of you gentlemen, as well as the National Advisory Commission that originally proposed the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, had a far broader and, it seem to me, somewhat deeper conception of this kind of a commission.

It was, as you have suggested, to be a voice for libraries and information science in the country and this is the reason that you have been concerned not to allow it simply to become one more agency within an operating Federal structure, concerned, as it were, to give a forum to the special though legitimate interests of various kinds of libraries in the Federal Establishment.

Have I misrepresented your general posture?

Dr. **Burkhardt.** No, it is exactly right.

Mr. **Brademas.** I appreciate very much hearing from both of you. Mr. Landgrebe?

Mr. **Landgrebe.** Mr. Chairman, I don't have any questions to ask. I would like to say welcome to our friend and colleague from Indiana. I have seen him around the Indiana Legislature over a period of years. No one, I think, in America would ever question his dedication to good education.

I am sure that his comments here are going to be extremely helpful in determining what course we will take in setting up this Commission and who will appoint them. I would not be a bit surprised but what we will find our good friend, Dr. Wells, on that Commission.

I think that is perhaps where he belongs.

Mr. **Brademas.** If the gentleman will yield, I hope that is one bipartisan effort he and I can both join and support.

Mr. **Landgrebe.** I am sorry I have not met Mr. Burkhardt, but we appreciate your being here, too.

Mr. **Brademas.** Mr. Gaydos?

Mr. **Gaydos.** I have no questions.

Mr. **Brademas.** The Chair wants to express his appreciation again to Dr. Burkhardt, Dr. Wells, to the Librarian of Congress, Mr. Mumford, and Dr. Venn, the Associate Commissioner of Education for having come and given us such very useful testimony here this morning.

The Chair would also like to announce that the next and, I believe, final day of hearings on this bill will be on Thursday of this week at 9:45 in this room, when we shall hear from a former member of this committee, former Congressman Carl Elliott, as well as from Roger McDonough, the president of the American Library Association; Mr. Roger Vosper, the head librarian, UCLA, appearing for the Association of Research Libraries; Carl Overhage, director, Project INTREX, MIT; Herbert White, the president of the Special Libraries Association; Dr. Robert Hayes of the School of Library Science at UCLA; and Mr. Joe Becker, the president of the American Society for Information Science.

We are adjourned for this morning.

(Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m. the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at 9:45 a.m., Thursday, April 17, 1969.)

TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1969

House of Representatives,
Select Subcommittee on Education
of the Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 9:45 a.m., pursuant to adjournment, in room 2257, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Brademas (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Brademas, Daniels, Reid, Scherle, Steiger, Collins, and Hansen.

Staff members present: Jim Harrison, staff director; Marty LaVor, minority research assistant; and Nancy Neilen, clerk.

Mr. Brademas. The subcommittee will come to order.

We are very pleased to continue today hearings on H.R. 8839, the proposal to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

The procedure that we will follow this morning is to hear from Mr. Elliott first and put some questions to him, and then we should like to call on the rest of the witnesses each in turn to present his testimony. And then we will put questions to all of you, en bloc, if that is satisfactory.

The Chair is very pleased to call on a very good personal friend and a man who is as responsible as any other Member of either the House or the Senate for the historic National Defense Education Act. During his many years of service in the Congress of the United States, he came to be a guide and inspiration to many of his junior colleagues on the House Committee on Education and Labor and the House of Representatives, generally. So I count it a particular honor and pleasure to be able to welcome our former colleague, a former Member of Congress from the State of Alabama, the Honorable Carl Elliott.

STATEMENT OF CARL ELLIOTT, ESQ., ATTORNEY AT LAW

Mr. Elliott. Mr. Chairman, coincidentally, it just occurred to me, Mr. Chairman, that the last time I sat before any part of the Committee on Education and Labor was in 1956, I believe, when I testified in behalf of the original Library Services Act.

I want to thank you and the members of your Select Subcommittee on Education for the opportunity to appear before you in support of H.R. 8839, a bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

As the chairman has pointed out, this subcommittee is a successor of the Special Education Subcommittee which I was privileged to chair here a dozen years ago. I remember so well, Mr. Chairman, when you came to the House Committee on Education and Labor, and I am most happy today that you are now busily engaged in fulfilling the promise that you brought with you when you came to the House.

As the more senior members of this committee know, I have been interested in, and identified with, libraries of all kinds for a long time. I voted for Federal aid for libraries in 1950. The 1950 bill failed to pass the House by three votes—yeas, 161; nays, 164. After we lost, we licked our wounds and wondered for 6 years.

In 1956, we passed the bill in substantially the same form as the 1950 Federal bill. This time, however, we called it the Library Services Act providing Federal aid for library service in rural areas. And, while 1956 is now actually only 13 years behind us, it really seems an eon.

The small farmer in Pennsylvania, east Texas, southern Appalachia, or southern California had a great deal more to say then about how this country was run than he does today. So we used the term "rural" in the title of the bill because the need was greater in the rural areas. In those days the votes of the farm bloc were very important.

In 1960, we extended the act for 5 years. In 1964, when we extended it again and added a small money authorization for construction, we called it the Library Services and Construction Act.

I think that these library laws, by whatever name, are among the most popular and important bills passed in my time in Congress.

These laws have resulted in greatly improved library services for all Americans. Let me call the roll: 1,250 public community libraries were constructed in America with Federal aid during the past 4 years;

In just the last 2 years, 20 million people have been added to those being served by public community libraries aided with Federal funds;

In the last 3 years, under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 43 million schoolchildren have been provided with 70 million books and audiovisual teaching aids; 62,000 libraries have been expanded and 3,600 new ones have been established; 250 special library centers have been opened;

Two thousand college and university libraries have been improved with financial assistance granted by the Higher Education Act of 1965; 4,700 school libraries have been enrolled in summer training institutes under the National Defense Education Act; and 1,350 graduate fellowships have been awarded in library science.

This is a record that this committee can view with especial pride because the laws bringing these benefits to the American people first saw the light of day right here in this committee.

In 1966, I was appointed by the President as a member of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. I took that work seriously. I attended the Commission meetings; and attended every single one of the dozen regional hearings.

I say all of this by way of background for the newer members of this committee, and in that vein, I would like to say that the approximately 10 years which I spent on this committee were the happiest years of my congressional life. Whatever little place in history I may have carved out for myself, was done right here.

Now that a few years have elapsed and we can see more clearly the effect of our joint actions in several of the areas in which I worked, I think all of us can take pride in what we did, and I personally want to thank the 11 members of the full Committee on Education and Labor who are still here, for the opportunities they gave me during the years I served in Congress.

History may not long regard the effect of my long, hard battle against George Wallace, and what he stands for, but I think history will record and remember what we here did in passing the Library Services Act, the National Defense Education Act, Public Law 565, and several others.

As I've said, one of the most popular bills this committee reported and sponsored during my time was the Library Services Act. The regional, grossroots hearings which the White House National Advisory Commission on Libraries held in 1967, showed that what we had done for public libraries was a most constructive and socially beneficial thing. For instance, the Library Services Act and subsequent library laws were spoken of 321 times in our regional hearings.

Bookmobiles, one of the key ideas in the original Library Services Act, were mentioned 300 times; 314 times the witnesses spoke out about the great need for many thousands better trained people to man America's libraries; 225 times they said that this country must provide a much better public library and informational system than we now have to serve the needs of the American people.

Also frequently mentioned were:

(1) The need to provide adequate library and informational services for formal education at all levels;

(2) The need to provide materials to support research in all fields at all levels;

(3) The need to provide adequate access to our Nation's research and informational resources; and

(4) The need to provide adequate physical access to required library materials all over the Nation.

Every single one of the five basic recommendations that our Commission made in its final report were heartily supported by the testimony of a great variety of citizens: Businessmen, professional people, scholars, scientists, farmers, white-collar and blue-collar workers, students and teachers at all levels, parents, local, State and National officials, all drawn from communities of varying size throughout the Nation.

There was testimony representing the blind, the aged, and virtually all religious and ethnic groups in America.

We found that the varied roles of the good public library are changing, that these libraries are evolving into multipurpose centers, media centers, that they are becoming forceful agencies for communication. A good library is a place where children whose economic and cultural opportunities are limited can feel free to reach out and up; where they can feel welcome and where they are received with understanding and friendship.

Our public libraries can become one of the major focal points for community life, providing not only the traditional library facilities but a variety of recreational and leisure-time programs for young and old alike, for life enrichment. We must see the library as a living center for disseminating knowledge, an aggressive agency for social and spiritual development, not just as a depository for books and papers. A public library should be an activity of the community, not just an institution of the community.

I know that each member of the committee would have been inspired, as was I, by seeing some of the library innovations that are taking place in our country:

The fertile mind of Leroy Marlowe, director of the State Technical Services Act programs of Pennsylvania evolved a plan whereby Library Services Act moneys in that State were used to purchase a bookmobile; the State Technical Services administration filled that bookmobile with technical books and information and sent it on its appointed rounds to serve the small industry of that State. When it got going, they called it "The Techmobile," because it was laden with the materials and technology which were being sought and which would prove to be helpful to the small businessmen and women of Pennsylvania.

Libraries must offer the inner-city people practical knowledge and it must communicate to them their own culture.

Mr. Chairman, one of the wonderful new things happening in a great many communities is the development of what I call "action libraries." Vacant space is found or made in the neighborhood. Families lend their own projectors and films, and volunteer to operate them. Audiovisual materials have been found to be one of the most successful methods of reaching and inducing nonusers of library services to become users. Ladies of the community volunteer to serve as librarians in "action libraries." Some volunteer to conduct story hours to preschoolers; some read to the youngsters. In many communities the library is indeed becoming the most exciting place in town.

In your own State, Mr. Chairman, I am informed by Mrs. Susan H. Crittenden, of Terre Haute, who was a member of my staff in my early days on this committee, that Terre Haute is right now in the process of building, through entirely volunteer efforts, the first "railroad car library" for the young people in the Hyte section of the city. As I understand it, one of the railroads gave the car; another constructed the track on which it rests; a local architect did the interior design work; a paint manufacturer furnished the paint; Painters Local No. 197 applied it; the Central Lakes Council is coordinating the work of several building trades unions doing renovation and remodeling on the car. The chamber of commerce, and nearly all other private organizations in the city are involved, as are numerous private individuals. Two members of the Neighborhood Youth Corps of the Office of Economic Opportunity are being trained to run this railroad car youth library. When they have completed their training, they will become staff members of the Vigo County Library System. According to Mrs. Crittenden, this project has everything. It is completely geared to youth. For instance, it has an advisory committee made up of young people between the ages of 15 and 20.

The National Advisory Commission on Libraries found from all of the studies, testimony and hearings, that there is an extremely wide range in both the character and adequacy of library services and library resources. What kind of library service an American has available to him may have the widest possible variation, depending on his means and where he lives.

In general, the areas of greatest poverty and social need and the institutions which are trying to deal with the most critical social and educational problems are those with the least adequate library services. The Commission also found that it is impossible at this time to present any reliable appraisal of the policies, programs, and practices of even one of the many, many agencies and institutions that are involved in giving library and information services to the American people.

One of the basic tasks of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science will be broad planning toward understanding and coordinating the present fragmented situation. There is no existing agency mechanism that can do this at this time. There are actually no complete statistics available for general use.

And I would like to say in addition to my statement at this time, Mr. Chairman, that I think one of the worst administrative tendencies in this Government of ours in recent years has been that of ignoring or not insisting upon the machinery with which to gather and publish and disseminate statistics about this great country of ours and its needs.

It is unbelievable how large the library needs of this country actually are, and they are growing larger by the hour. Even now, we are spending only $35 million a year for library services under the Library Services and Construction Act. The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science proposed by this bill will focus on the needs, and report on them, to the end that we will have sufficient information before the Congress and the Executive at all times so they can coordinate the attempts to solve the many new and complex problems in meeting the library user needs of the American people. All facets of the library and information science field must work together to eliminate such overlapping, duplication, and lack of coordination as now exists.

The new Commission can and should do a continuing examination of changing library needs, and point out available or possible means for meeting them, in the light of emerging priorities and costs.

Of the achievements in improved library services which have come about in recent years through Federal legislation in aiding libraries, none has been planned as part of a comprehensive whole. This permanent Commission, that this bill seeks to establish, would aid the Congress by preparing broad, comprehensive, interlocking plans toward which Americans may work and by which the Congress could judge the needs for proposed legislation and funding.

The tasks of analyzing needs, broad planning, standards, allocating resources, measuring performance and coordinating efforts will be difficult in the years ahead. Effective progress can be fostered by the sustained effort of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science studying and recommending procedures and plans for their solution.

> To avoid haphazard and fragmented response to the inevitable forces of a changing society, a national plan is required that can be used to guide the next steps of all participants toward a recognized and achievable goal of adequate library service to all Americans. Because of the deep involvement of the Federal Government as producer, processor, and user of information, and because this is a matter closely touching the national welfare, the leadership of the Federal Government is essential to the success of any plan.

States the report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries.

The leadership which the Federal Government can provide immediately is the establishment on the ongoing permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. New thinking and coordinated planning are critically needed regarding the distribution of responsibility and financial support to the various types of libraries within each region of the country if we are to serve the increasingly diverse demands of the American people.

At present, there is no direction by any national agency concerned with the total information problem. As separate services proliferate, grow and succeed, the prospect for standardization and compatibility diminishes.

The Advisory Commission of which I was a member, foresees more severe future inadequacies unless all participants in the management and use of information, whether they be documentalists in the Department of Defense or librarians serving the needs of highly specialized user groups, they can look to coherent national planning and coordinated research and development.

This bill, H.R. 8839, charges the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science with the responsibility of preparing full-scale plans and recommendations to deal with the Nation's library and information needs, and for advising the Federal Government, and other agencies, institutions, and groups—both public and private—with respect to those needs.

As our Commission's report notes, almost all representatives of library, scholarly, educational, scientific, and other professional associations who testified before it, gave high priority in their recommendations to the creation of such a commission as the bills before you envision.

In 1960, the then Vice President of the United States Richard M. Nixon wrote Congressman Stuyvesant Wainwright a letter which he quoted in the August 22, 1960 Congressional Record, expressing the desires of the then Vice President to see that the American people are provided with library and information services adequate to their needs.

Mr. Brademas. If you will allow me to interrupt you.

I would like to ask unanimous consent, following the paragraph in which you alluded to Mr. Nixon's letter, that the text of it be included in the hearing record.

Please go ahead.

(Letter from Vice President Richard Nixon to Hon. Stuyvesant Wainwright taken from the Congressional Record, p. H17054, Aug. 22, 1960.)

August 22, 1960.

Hon. Stuyvesant Wainwright,
House of Representatives.

Dear Stuyve: I note that H.R. 12125 is to be considered today in the House under suspension of rules. This bill would extend the Library Services Act beyond its present statutory termination date of June 30, 1961. I understand that the Senate passed a bill to similar effect (S. 2830) on May 26, 1960.

Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick testified in support of extension of the act before your subcommittee on April 7, 1960.

I share the belief held by many, reflected in part by the large number of bills with bipartisan sponsorship which have been introduced in this Congress to extend the act, that it would be highly desirable to do so during this session of the Congress. Such timing of an extension would obviate uncertainty on the part of States and communities regarding the continued availability of Federal funds with which to plan and carry out programs of improved library services.

I am heartily in support of the basic purpose of the act; namely, to stimulate the States and rural communities to provide better public library service in rural areas. I understand that much has been accomplished since the act became effective in 1956. However, I also understand that the full attainment of the objective which Congress sought by this legislation would only be achieved if the act were extended.

I hope the House will act favorably on this bill.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. ELLIOTT. In the past 20 years, a new attitude toward libraries has evolved as a consequence of our recognition that information is now a national resource and that its skillful management for easy use is vital in almost every national undertaking.

At the same time, changes in traditional patterns of library use, changes in library constituencies and library functions have alerted us to the need for new interlibrary relationships and for new patterns in service.

We immediately and urgently need a continuing Commission, national in its interests and widely representative of the social instrumentalities and functions that libraries serve, which can continually appraise and reevaluate the problems of national information services and the evolution of library systems, which can identify the areas where solutions cannot be achieved through local or regional effort alone, and which can identify the undertakings that the Federal Government should stimulate or even support.

One theme which emerged throughout all the activities of the Advisory Commission that I served on is that "there is a strong social benefit awareness, a service orientation that pervades every existing and conceivable library and information function. Perhaps it is not too soon to propose the criterion of social value as the most important in decisionmaking—whether for broad central planning, more specific planning, or immediate problem solving. We should look at the value to our people and our culture that accrues from the activities of the user whose functions are to be enhanced by improved availability of library and information services. A library can be understood only as it enhances a socially valuable function, one of which—and one that all libraries can enhance—is the personal intellectual and ethical development of every individual in our society. The variety of the other socially valuable functions determines the need for variety in kinds of libraries," again states the report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries.

In this spirit of social awareness, the Advisory Commission developed its recommendations for a national library policy, a part of which is included in H.R. 8839 and the bills companion to it.

H.R. 8839 proposes:

1. Congressional affirmation (sec. 2) that library and information services adequate to meet the needs of the people of the United States

are essential to achieve national goals and to utilize most effectively the Nation's education resources and that the Federal Government will cooperate with State and local government and public and private agencies is assuring effective provision of such services;

2. Establishment of an independent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, with administrative services to be provided by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for which payment or reimbursement shall be made;

3. Specific functions, enumerated in section 5, stemming from a stated primary responsibility for developing plans for and advising the appropriate governments and agencies on the policy set forth in section 2 of the bill.

The proposed Commission would:

(1) Advise the President and the Congress on the development and setting in motion of national policy by such statements, presentations, and reports as it deems appropriate;

(2) Conduct studies, surveys, and analyses of the library and informational needs of the Nation and the means by which these needs may be met through information centers, and through the libraries of elementary and secondary schools; libraries of institutions of higher education, and through public, research, special, and other types of libraries;

(3) evaluate the effectiveness of library and information science programs and disseminate the results thereof;

(4) develop overall plans for meeting national library and informational needs and for the coordination of activities at the Federal, State, and local levels taking into consideration all of the library and informational resources of the Nation to meet those needs;

(5) provide technical assistance and advice to Federal, State, local and private agencies regarding library and information sciences;

(6) promote research and development activities which will extend and improve the Nation's library and information-handling capability as essential links in the national communications networks; and

(7) submit to the President and the Congress (not later than January 1 of each year) a report on its activities during the preceding fiscal year. The Commission would be authorized to contract with Federal agencies and other public and private agencies to aid it in carrying out any of its functions, and to publish and disseminate such reports, findings, studies, and records as it deems appropriate. The Commission would also be authorized to conduct such hearings at such times and places as it deems appropriate for carrying out the purposes of the act. The heads of all Federal agencies are, to the extent not prohibited by law, directed to cooperate with the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this act.

4. That the Commission be composed of 15 members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for terms of 5 years on a staggered basis; I personally believe that the law should read "One-third of the 15 members of the Commission shall be professional librarians or information specialists, and the remainder shall be persons having special competence or interest in the needs of our society for library and information services."

5. It provides for a staff of such professional and technical personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its duties; I would

like to make it known for the record that the staff is envisioned to be made up of a total of about 12 people.

6. A provision allowing the Commission to procure temporary and intermittent consultative services to assist in its studies;

7. An authorization of $500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970 and for each succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be appropriated by Congress for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this act.

H.R. 8839 provides a good solid foundation upon which the future can be constructively planned and developed. Library development is an essential element in such national objectives as the elimination of poverty and the achievement of rapid social and economic growth, and it requires and deserves national support.

While at times, it may have looked as if there was disagreement among the members of the Advisory Commission on which I served, in the final analysis there was a basic commonalty which fused together and produced a strong, eloquent, unanimous report.

Even though the work and financial support of the President's Advisory Commission on Libraries has terminated, the activity has not come to a standstill. As a demonstration of the varied interests in and the possible cooperation between private and commercial and Government enterprises is the fact that a privately supported university (Duke) and a commercial publisher (Bowker) have joined forces in order to document the federally sponsored National Advisory Commission on Libraries' studies, conclusions, recommendations, activities, variety of materials, and data (including 10 of the special studies), in an attempt to synthesize and document a very complex set of problems and issues which will continue to provide resource on library and information science in the crucial decade ahead. The book, "Libraries at Large," which will supplement the Advisory Commission's report, will be published this spring.

Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan bill will not cost much of anything, and I verily believe that the benefits will far outweigh its costs.

The library needs of this Nation are about $15 billion now, $15 billion. I was in one of the States of the Union just the other day in which they were setting up the rudiments of an information system, the first installment of cost would be $7 million. For the long pull, Mr. Chairman, I say this advisedly, we don't have much choice about whether we raise the money. There will be a lot of debate and discussion about how and where this is done. The National Commission proposed by this bill should contribute a lot to seeing that our Nation gets its money's worth.

Thank you.

Mr. **Brademas**. Thank you very much, indeed, for that splendid statement.

I think I take issue with only one observation in your testimony in which you made a comment about your, to quote your statement, "little place in history." In my own judgment, as a member of this committee for a little over 10 years now, when the legislative history of the last several years is written I think the place of Carl Elliott will be a very significant and impressive one.

I was struck all the more by your testimony by virtue of the fact that you have been a member of the National Advisory Commission and that you took part in all of the meetings and the hearings of the Commission. I think that lends still further weight to what you have had to say.

I have several questions to ask you.

First, may I note I had not realized until you mentioned it that the report of the National Advisory Commission was a unanimous one. You said in the last part of your statement the library needs of the Nation are at about $15 billion. What does that figure represent and what is its source, could you tell us?

Mr. **Elliott.** That figure comes from the best information we were able to get for the Commission I served on, Mr. Chairman, and it would include bringing the Nation to the goal of providing a reasonably adequate library service to the entire Nation. We are so deficient, particularly in our public library facilities and services in this country.

I wish I had the time to describe the conditions that we found with respect to our public library system in the United States when we held the regional hearings in the fall of 1967.

The only university that the people have, Mr. Chairman, once they are out of school and they are settled in their workaday routine and world, the only university they have is the public library. And the people of the United States, that great student body of the peoples' university, are entitled to more information, to better information, to more up-to-date information, to information more easily found and disseminated than is true today. And that is not to take away from wonderful people who operate the Nation's system of public libraries. But I am convinced that if the people knew how really bad their public libraries are, that you would be able to pass a bill in Congress here to do 10 times as much as you are able to do at the present time. The condition is shocking from Nome, Alaska to Tampa, Fla., and from the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., Tucson, Ariz., to Wilkes-Barre, Pa., or Savannah, Ga. Whatever section of the country you go to, you will find totally inadequate library service, particularly in the small towns and the rural areas.

We do have some wonderful city libraries that have good support of the communities in which they are located, but even they would be the first to admit the many deficiencies.

The best information we could get, Mr. Chairman, is that man's knowledge, man's recorded knowledge, will just about triple in the decade between 1960 and 1970; nearly three times. If you were a merchant you would say that was a complete turnover in 3⅓ years. That is what we face and this information must be made readily available. To do so it is going to cost an awful lot of money and this Commission needs to be established, I think, to do some of the preliminary spadework that needs to be done to enable Congress to act most wisely.

Mr. **Brademas.** I was interested in your reference to the needs of rural libraries, because I remember very well that just 10 years ago this year, my first year on this committee, that about the first controversy I got into with a member of the committee had to do with rural libraries. My recollection is, that the State of Indiana was one of the two or three States in the Union that were not taking part in the rural library program. And I exacted a promise from the three candidates of my party for the gubernatorial nomination before the State convention that if one should be elected that he would see to it that the State of Indiana did take part in the program. And on the strengths of that commitment, our late and distinguished colleague, Congressman John Fogarty, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that handled this matter, put the money back in the appropriations bill. Though I think there were some other issues in that campaign, I am glad to say that we did elect one of those fellows Governor and he did write Indiana back into the Union.

I am distressed to say—and this is just a footnote—that our present Governor seems hellbent on taking us out of the Union again in the last several weeks, but that is another matter.

Mr. Elliott, a spokesman for the administration came before our subcommittee yesterday to speak on this bill and I don't think I misrepresent his position when I say it is roughly the following: That he was against the proposed Commission being an independent agency. He wanted it located within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He was opposed to the members of the Commission being appointed by the President and recommended that they be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He was against the Commission having any other than advisory functions; that is to say, he was opposed to the Commission promoting research and development and providing technical assistance and he favored confining the scope of activities of the proposed Commission to Federal library programs. Finally, he believed that we should stipulate representatives of various Federal agencies that deal with libraries as members of the Commission.

Aside from those reservations, he was hopeful that the bill that we had was a strong bill and was anxious to strengthen the Commission by his recommendations.

I wonder if you have any comment on the position taken yesterday?

Mr. Elliott. Mr. Chairman, I have been out for 4 or 5 years, but in my judgment in order for a commission to be real important and to draw the kind of people that it ought to have serving on it, it needs to a Presidential commission. It needs to be appointed by the President. That does give it an added standing or stature in the country which any other type of commission does not have when it is appointed by any lesser official than the President of the United States.

This Commission can be very important. And my thought is that it ought to be totally independent. I think I would even be against the provision, if I knew any solution to it otherwise, of housing it in HEW. It ought to be independent. It ought to be totally independent. **It shouldn't be in the position** to have to go down to one of the departments begging for funds with which to operate or for office space in which to carry on its work. It ought to be independent and have the opportunity of building for itself such respect as it deserves to have.

I think I have pretty well indicated that I don't agree with most of the points that—and I am not sure that I got them all—the chairman mentioned.

Mr. Brademas. I would just observe that I would hope that among the activities the Commission that we are talking about would give at least a little attention to the information problem of the Members of Congress.

When you talk about there being a multiplication by a factor of 3 of information in the next 10 years, that appalls me when I consider the paper that comes into our offices now. I don't know if you are aware of the fact, but the executive branch of the Government, by the middle of this year, will have at its disposal 4,000 computers at an annual cost of $2 billion. The Congress of the United States has three computers; one over in the Senate used for speeding the delivery of inside mail; another in the House used chiefly for payroll purposes; and another in the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress to report on the status of bills.

I hope that in time somebody will come along with some specifics, and some of us in Congress, in both sides of the aisle, are working on this matter now to give a little attention to this problem, because I think it has a direct bearing on the separation of powers constitutional system.

As it is now, with the Executive having a virtual monopoly of operative access to intelligence and information, we are at an immense disadvantage if one agrees, as I suppose most of us do, that information is power.

One other final short question. The Librarian of Congress, Mr. Mumford, suggested yesterday an amendment to the bill which would have the effect of allowing the Commission to receive private gifts, grants and bequests. Do you have any comment on that suggestion?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I think that would be perfectly in order, that the Commission be able to receive such bequests or gifts. I don't think there will be very much activity in that field, but it ought to have that power, I think.

Mr. BRADEMAS. One of the most industrious members of the Committee on Education and Labor is one who has a particular deep interest in the legislation before us. I would like to ask Mr. Steiger to put any questions he may have to you.

Mr. STEIGER. I have no questions. It is a pleasure to see a man who served in this body with such distinction and has made a contribution in his work on the Commission.

I have read your testimony and I appreciate your comments.

I can only say, as I was coming down the corridor, my antenna went out when I started to hear the chairman's comments about what Mr. Venn had said before in his testimony to the committee. So I wanted to get here to protect the administration, not that it needs to be protected. Though, in this case, I think it could use some protection.

I appreciate the chairman's letting me ask the question.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Elliott, thank you very much, indeed, for having come, sir.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Thank you. It is a real pleasure to appear before my old committee.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am pleased at this time to call on a distinguished former chairman of this subcommittee and most distinguished member of it still, who has become the chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Labor in this Congress, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Daniels, to introduce one of the witnesses who will be testifying before our subcommittee this morning.

Mr. Daniels?

Mr. DANIELS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your kindness in affording me this opportunity to present a very distinguished citizen of the State of New

Jersey, Mr. Roger H. McDonough, who is the president of the American Library Association.

Mr. McDonough's work has been especially appreciated by his fellow citizens of New Jersey, where he serves as director of the State library archives and history of the State department of education.

Mr. McDonough has testified in the past before this committee and we have found his testimony has been of invaluable help and I am quite sure that whatever thoughts and ideas he has on this important legislation which is pending before this committee today will prove very much of value and assistance to you and our colleagues on this committee.

I want to join in your comments about the very distinguished former member of this committee who was also chairman of the subcommittee upon which I had the honor and privilege to serve, Mr. Carl Elliott. I want to say to you that he was one of the members who worked very, very hard and it was my pleasure to serve under his chairmanship. And I learned very, very much about the legislative process because of my service under his able leadership.

I would like to note for the record that I am sorry that I cannot stay for the subsequent testimony. I know that they will contribute much of value. I must appear before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, where I chair the Subcommittee on Insurance, Retirement, and Health Benefits. We have a bill coming up before that committee which affects 2,700,000 Federal employees' pension rights. And I know this bill is of great interest to every Federal and civil employee. So I regret that I will not be able to stay for their testimony and also not have the opportunity to ask some questions which I have prepared for this purpose.

So, if I have the opportunity of getting back, I shall be back later this morning.

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am sure you will profit from the testimony of all of these gentlemen who will testify.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Daniels.

Could the next group of witnesses please come to the table and just take your seats, gentlemen. Then I will ask each of you to identify himself.

I suggest that each of you try perhaps to either read his statement rather rapidly or summarize the gist of it, and then Mr. Steiger and I will put questions to all of you on the panel.

If you will just raise your hand or nod as I call the roll, so we will know who is who.

Roger H. McDonough, president of the American Library Association; Robert Vosper, university librarian of the University of California, Los Angeles, representing the Association of Research Libraries; Mr. Carl Overhage, director of Project Intrex, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Mr. Herbert White, president of the Special Libraries Association; Dr. Robert Hayes, professor, UCLA; and Mr. Joseph Becker, president of the American Society for Information Science.

Gentlemen, the order in which I have called your names is the order in which they appear on my list. If that is agreeable to you, we will commence with you, Mr. McDonough.

STATEMENT OF ROGER H. McDONOUGH, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF STATE LIBRARY ARCHIVES AND HISTORY, STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, NEW JERSEY

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to appear before the committee.

I am grateful to you, sir, and the American Library Association is also, for sponsoring this legislation. And I am highly gratified that two Congressmen from New Jersey, Mr. Frank Thompson and Mr. Dominick Daniels, are on the bill.

To save time, I am going to excerpt my prepared remarks and will submit the full text for the record, with your permission, along with a couple of resolutions that I may refer to.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Without objection, the statement will be printed at this point.

(The statement and resolutions referred to follow:)

STATEMENT BY ROGER H. McDONOUGH, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF STATE LIBRARY ARCHIVES AND HISTORY, STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, NEW JERSEY

My name is Roger McDonough. I am President of the American Library Association, a non-profit educational organization of over 40,000 members which has striven for nearly one hundred years to further the development of school, college, university, research and public libraries as a highly essential bulwark to education, science, technology, business and culture. At present I am state librarian of New Jersey, and among my duties is the administration of the Library Services and Construction Act and Title II of the Elementary and Secondary School Act and other Federal legislation.

Speaking as President of the American Library Association, I wish to endorse wholeheartedly H.R. 8839, which has been introduced into the House to establish a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. I should like to add, also, that the Council, the governing body of the ALA, adopted a resolution approving the principles embodied in H.R. 8839 and similar measures at its Midwinter Conference on January 30, 1969, in Washington, D.C.

The American Library Association welcomed the establishment of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries in 1966. The Association looked forward to the far-reaching and thorough survey which the Commission completed and the recommendations made in its Report which was presented to the President last October. If these recommendations are implemented, the long-range objectives in providing adequate library and information service to all the American people can be achieved.

The Advisory Commission's first and most important single recommendation that must be implemented is the establishment of a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a continuing Federal agency for broad planning and coordination. The Advisory Commission, in its consensus report, stated "The present Commission's efforts to analyze current and future national library needs, assess the strengths and weaknesses of existing library resources and services, and evaluate the effects of library legislation, leave the members with the absolute conviction that the goal of library adequacy will be achieved only as a consequence of long-range planning and fostering of the evolutionary process of library development. This will require taking advantage of present and emerging knowledge in information science; it will require encouraging and exploiting future research.

". . . it should be stated here that the tasks of analyzing the needs, broad planning, setting standards, allocating resources, measuring performance, and coordinating efforts will be difficult and complex in the years ahead. Effective progress will require the sustained effort of the recommended ongoing National Commission on Libraries and Information Science working with Federal agencies, the national libraries, and many other institutions, groups, and individuals."

The permanent ongoing National Commission on Libraries and Information Science should be charged with the responsibility of preparing full-scale plans to deal with the nation's library and information needs, and for advising the

Federal Government and other agencies, institutions, and groups—both public and private, with respect to those needs.

The objectives of the American Library Association in supporting H.R. 8839 are rooted in the belief that an informed citizenry is essential to our democratic society; that only through a continuing educational process can we attain our maximum competence and satisfaction as individuals and as citizens of our community, state and nation; and that the free, ready access to the accumulated knowledge of man is basic to improving our way of life.

The permanent Commission would make recommendations for the coordination of existing library and information science resources and services which are an integral part of all communities, schools, colleges, universities, and other organizations and institutions. In addition, it would have the responsibility of advising the Federal Government on further national requirements for such resources and services.

The need of the Nation for library services and resources is bigger than what is encompassed in the legislation already in effect and programs in operation. The Commission will not be a new layer placed on existing layers of governmental activity. It will instead be concerned with evaluating all library and information activities both within and without the government and proposing measures to mitigate deficiencies found to exist.

There has been substantial progress attributable to legislation enacted by the Congress during the last ten years although the level of appropriations has been far below the authorizations which represented minimum requirements. The gap between current resources and actual needs is so great that unless giant steps are taken to close it soon, the Nation's libraries will be dangerously inadequate in face of unparalleled growth of population and knowledge.

Library resources encompass human knowledge in all its forms, totality, and complexity, and must be organized in ways that will make it possible to readily locate and disseminate ideas and information to satisfy the needs and demands of individuals and groups in our dynamic society.

Libraries, as essential institutions in the total educational structure of our democracy and as the primary depositories of man's knowledge and ideas, have direct responsibility in making all books and other materials of communication readily available and in sufficient quantity to Americans of all ages, races, creeds, and circumstances. In performing this essential work, libraries require and deserve public support at all levels of government. The Nation itself has a stake in achieving this goal.

A long tradition has existed of free access to libraries in America. This tradition is reflected in each statement of standards published by the various types of libraries. In each instance, it is emphasized that convenient access is central to fulfillment of the library's purpose in relationship to the needs of its constituency—be it public, school, academic, institutional, or special library.

According to the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, I am quoting: "New thinking and planning are critically needed regarding the distribution of responsibility and financial support to the various types of libraries if we are to serve the increasing demands. . . ." It also goes on to state:

"To avoid haphazard and fragmented response to the inevitable forces of a changing society, national planning is required that can be used to guide the next steps of all participants toward a recognized and achievable goal of adequate library service to all Americans. Because of the deep involvement of the Federal Government as producer, processor and user of information, and because this is a matter closely touching the national welfare, the leadership of the Federal Government is essential to the success of any plan."

The ultimate solution to this large and complex national problem would lie in the development by the proposed Commission of national plans which would serve as the framework for total library service for all. It would produce a coordinated attack based on experience, cooperation, innovation, and the results of research deeper and broader in scope than has ever been undertaken. New concepts must be expanded and old ones reevaluated. The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science would not be taking the place of any existing agency or mechanism but it would coordinate objectives and activities and thereby eliminate wasteful duplication and fragmentation of efforts.

Only through the development of a network of library and information services which can cope with equal effectiveness with the needs of the undereducated and the most sophisticated will the problem of equal informational opportunity be resolved. Therefore, it is recommended that studies leading to the achievement of this goal be pursued vigorously in the national interest and that the coordinating agency be a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Such a Commission from its overall viewpoint could lend forceful support on budget matters, on executive policy, and on communication techniques which should mold the libraries throughout the Nation. There is no existing mechanism or agency that can be this representative, nor exert such broad influence.

The permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science will be able to see the country's information system as a whole and the relationship of all libraries to it, as well as the interrelationships among the various types of units. Thus it would ensure that the various links in the overall library and information network continue to form an effective chain of responsibility for service, from the smallest to the largest unit and from the richest to the poorest.

Although this present legislation only deals with the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, it is seen by the American Library Association as a cardinal first step toward the long-range action objectives so clearly enunciated by the National Advisory Commission on Libraries.

I appreciate the opportunity which your Committee has afforded me in presenting testimony on this desirable legislation.

Resolution Adopted by the ALA Council, the Governing Body of the American Library Association, at the Association's Midwinter Conference in Washington, D.C., January 30, 1969

Whereas, the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries is the result of comprehensive study into the current status and future needs of the Nation's libraries and of extensive citizen hearings; and,

Whereas, the Commisison's Report, received by the President of the United States October 15, 1968, is the most far-reaching statement of library needs and goals ever enunciated by an official body of the Federal Government; and,

Whereas, this document presents a perceptive appraisal of the immediate and future requirements of all types of libraries to enable them to serve more effectively as vital, relevant institutions for all the people, and proposes responsible and realistic objectives to overcome current inadequacies and develop library services to their full potential; and,

Whereas, the National Advisory Commission on Libraries has recommended "That it be declared National Policy that the American people should be provided with library and information services adequate to their needs, and that the Federal Government, in collaboration with State and local governments and private agencies, should exercise leadership in assuring the provision of such services"; and

Whereas, the necessity for coordinated, long-range planning and evaluation to determine feasible ways of meeting the new and growing demands of library users is widely recognized;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that we, the Council of the American Library Association, do hereby endorse and support the statement of National Policy and the establishment by Congress of a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a continuing Federal planning agency.

Resolution To Support Recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries

Whereas, the Mountain-Plains Library Association, comprising the States of Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming, is assembled in conference in Salt Lake City, Utah, to consider "The Challenge of Change to Mountain-Plains Libraries," and

Whereas, the Mountain-Plains Library Association has received the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries and found it highly commendable and worthy of implementation, inasmuch as it points out the historical highlights and structural necessities of library service and recommends responsible and realistic objectives to overcome current inadequacies and develop library and information services for the Nation's future needs, and

Whereas, the Mountain-Plains Library Association has noted and found laudable the recognition of the criterion of social value that pervades every existing and conceivable library and information function.

Now, therefore be it resolved that we, the Mountain-Plains Library Association, do hereby endorse and support the recommendation of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries:

> That it be declared National Policy, enunciated by the President and enacted into law by the Congress that the American people should be provided with library and information services adequate to their needs, and that the Federal Government, in collaboration with State and local governments and private agencies, should exercise leadership in assuring the provision of such services.

And finally, be it resolved that the Mountain-Plains Library Association urges and supports the efforts of the Committee on Legislation of the American Library Association to work for implementation of the recommendations for achieving the objectives set forth in the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, particularly the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a continuing Federal planning agency.

Mr. McDonough. I would like to begin, however, and I thought of this as I listened to Mr. Elliott's eloquent remarks and talked with Mr. Daniels informally before the hearing opened, by saying that I have been in the business of library planning for over 30 years, when I served as a member of the Regional Library Development Committee back in the mid-1930's.

When I look back on it, our progress was agonizingly slow and I think this has been the case throughout the country in other States and regions.

And for this reason, sir, I look upon this proposal that is encompassed in your bill to establish a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, as really a tremendous development which is the culmination of what we have been working toward for many, many years.

I think that when this Commission is established—and I think it will be, sir—that libraries will have arrived at a point that is unparalleled in the history of the country.

Our association, as I believe you know, includes more than 40,000 librarians, trustees, and others, representing all kinds of libraries, public school, college, university, special—meaning those in business and industry, et cetera.

I speak as the president of that association and in my capacity as State Librarian of New Jersey, where I, in addition to serving the legislature with our traditional legislative reference service, also administer some Federal programs, the Library Services and Construction Act, and title II of the 1965 legislation, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I wish to endorse wholeheartedly H.R. 8839, which has been introduced into the House to establish a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

I should like to add, also, that the Council of the American Library Association, our governing body, adopted a resolution here in Washington in January at its midwinter meeting, approving the principles embodied in H.R. 8839 and other similar measures. I have already asked to have that resolution introduced into the record.

We welcomed the establishment of the National Advisory Commission in 1966 and we looked forward to the far-reaching and thorough survey which the Commission completed, as well as the recommendations in its report which was presented to the President last October.

In our opinion, if these recommendations are implemented, the long-range objectives in providing adequate library and information service to all the American people can be achieved.

As you well know, the Advisory Commission's first and most important recommendation that must be implemented is the establishment of a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as a continuing Federal agency for broad planning and coordination. As the Advisory Commission, in its consensus report, stated:

> **The present Commission's efforts to analyze current and future national library needs, assess the strengths and weaknesses of existing library resources and services, and evaluate the effects of library legislation, leave the members with the absolute conviction that the goal of library adequacy will be achieved only as a consequence of long-range planning and fostering of the evolutionary process of library development. This will require taking advantage of present and emerging knowledge in information science; it will require encouraging and exploiting future research.**
>
> **. . . it should be stated here that the tasks of analyzing the needs, broad planning, setting standards, allocating resources, measuring performance, and coordinating efforts will be difficult and complex in the years ahead. Effective progress will require the sustained effort of the recommended ongoing National Commission on Libraries and Information Science working with Federal agencies, the national libraries, and many other institutions, groups, and individuals.**

The permanent ongoing National Commission on Libraries and Information Science should be charged with the responsibility of preparing full-scale plans to deal with the Nation's library and information needs, and for advising the Federal Government and other agencies, institutions, and groups—both public and private—with respect to those needs.

The permanent Commission would make recommendations for the coordination of existing library and information science resources and services which are an integral part of all communities, schools, colleges, universities, and other organizations and institutions. In addition, it would have the responsibility of advising the Federal Government on further national requirements for such resources and services.

The need of the Nation for library services and resources goes far beyond what is encompassed in the legislation already in effect and programs in operation. The Commission will not be a new layer placed on existing layers of governmental activity. Instead, it will be concerned with evaluating all library and information activities, both within and without the Government, and proposing measures to mitigate deficiencies found to exist.

There has been substantial progress attributable to legislation enacted by the Congress during the last 10 years, although the level of appropriations has been far below the authorizations which represented minimum requirements. The gap between current resources and actual needs is so great that unless giant steps are taken to close it soon, the Nation's libraries will be dangerously inadequate in face of unparalleled growth of population and knowledge.

And I think former Congressman Elliott has testified very eloquently to that point.

Library resources encompass human knowledge in all its forms, totality, and complexity, and must be organized in ways that will make it possible to readily locate and disseminate ideas and information to satisfy the needs and demands of individuals and groups in our dynamic society.

A long tradition has existed of free access to libraries in America. This tradition is reflected in each statement of standards published by the various types of libraries. In each instance, it is emphasized that convenient access is central to fulfillment of the library's purpose in relationship to the needs of its constituency—be it public school, academic, institutional, or any kind of library.

According to the report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries:

> New thinking and planning are critically needed regarding the distribution of responsibility and financial support to the various types of libraries if we are to serve the increasing demands.

It also goes on to state:

> To avoid haphazard and fragmented response to the inevitable forces of a changing society, national planning is required that can be used to guide the next steps of all participants toward a recognized and achievable goal of adequate library service to all Americans. Because of the deep involvement of the Federal Government as producer, processor and user of information, and because this is a matter closely touching the national welfare, the leadership of the Federal Government is essential to the success of any plan.

The ultimate solution to this large and complex national problem would lie in the development by the proposed Commission of national plans which would serve as the framework for total library service for all. It would produce a coordinated attack based on experience, cooperation, innovation, and the results of research deeper and broader in scope than has ever been undertaken. New concepts must be expanded and old ones reevaluated. The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science would not be taking the place of any existing agency or mechanism, but it would coordinate objectives and activities and thereby eliminate wasteful duplication and fragmentation of efforts.

Only through the development of a network of library and information services which can cope with equal effectiveness with the needs of the undereducated, as well as the most sophisticated, will the problem of equal information opportunity be resolved. Therefore, it is recommended that studies leading to the achievement of this goal be pursued vigorously in the national interest and that the coordinating agency be a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

Such a Commission, from its overall viewpoint, could lend forceful support on budget matters, on executive policy, and on communication techniques which should mold the libraries throughout the Nation. There is no existing mechanism or agency that can be this representative, nor exert such broad influence.

The permanent National Commission On Libraries and Information Science will be able to see the country's information system as a whole and the relationship of all libraries to it, as well as the interrelationships among the various types of units. Thus, it would insure that the various links in the overall library and information network continue to form an effective chain of responsibility for service, from the smallest to the largest unit and from the richest to the poorest.

Although this present legislation only deals with the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, it is seen by the American Library Association as a cardinal first step toward the long-range action objectives so clearly enunciated by the National Advisory Commission on Libraries.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee on behalf of this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Brademas. Thank you very much, Mr. McDonough.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT VOSPER, UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, REPRESENTING THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Mr. Vosper. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Robert Vosper, university librarian of the University of California, Los Angeles.

I think one of the interesting things thus far in the library profession and its service to the people in this country and many others is that library organizations persistently work together and do not compete with each other.

The group I represent is primarily made up of large academic and research libraries from UCLA to Wisconsin and Texas. These libraries cooperate voluntarily not only with academic libraries, but also with the large public libraries and other research libraries that serve the country.

I will try, Mr. Chairman, not to read my paper but to concentrate on two or three pertinent points. I would appreciate having the full report read into the record along with the accompanying recommendation from the association.

Mr. Brademas. Without objection, so ordered.

(The statement and recommendation referred to follow:)

Statement by Robert Vosper

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: I am Robert Vosper, University Librarian of the University of California, Los Angeles, and also a Director and former Chairman of the Association of Research Libraries, the organization which I am representing today.

The Association of Research Libraries (generally known as ARL), established in 1932, comprises 80 institutional members, the larger university libraries of the country and certain other research libraries of national importance. A list of the members has been given to the Committee. While these are independent institutions serving particular clienteles, they are voluntarily interrelated in a variety of ways so that their collections and services are widely available to scholars and advanced students throughout the country. They have long recognized this larger social responsibility and have continuously been seeking ways to improve and extend their capacity thus to serve the nation. The support of the Congress in the Higher Education Act has also been of assistance in this regard.

In this effort to increase our coordinate strength and efficiency, we have increasingly felt the need for an overall guiding intelligence at the national level. Thus, in behalf of the Association, I am pleased to support H.R. 8839 which would establish a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. May I also append to my testimony a copy of the ARL's official statement in support of this and other aspects of the Report of the earlier National Advisory Commission on Libraries.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, it is not merely trite to say that we are at a crucial turning point in the history of libraries. This is why the United States needs such a Commission—to be certain that we go down the right road, at the proper speed, and with continuous rather than intermittent guidance.

I remember an earlier turning point when the Congress provided timely leadership into a new public library future. This was in 1956 with the passage of the Library Services Act, a truly historic legislative innovation.

Its purpose was to extend to families in rural and less populated areas the kind of public library services traditionally available in cities and larger towns. At that time I was Librarian of the University of Kansas, and I still count among my friends a number of the wonderful people who came in from their farms to Hutchinson and Pratt and Hays to discuss the new Act with their county officials. They wanted to bring a better supply of books to their friends and their children by way of multi-county contracts that the Library Services Act facilitated, as well as by bookmobiles. That Act brought the very first bookmobile to Kansas. At the same time I remember that my University's Medical Library in Kansas City used to mail parcels of books out to doctors on the High Plains at a time when we were trying to encourage young doctors to settle and practice in small towns, isolated from libraries and other essential facilities.

Well, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, we have come a long way since 1956, and those early efforts look pretty primitive. Yet that Act in 1956 was historic because for the first time it brought the Federal Government into library planning and library extension in behalf of all the people.

In the intervening years several compelling developments have changed the scene dramatically. The so-called "information explosion" has multiplied the amount of significant publication and useful information needed by scholars, researchers, government officials, practitioners in many fields of endeavor, and informed citizens. This "information explosion" has occurred, to a considerable extent, because of the increasing pace and amount of research—scientific, technical, and sociological research—that the Federal government has fostered at universities and in industry. In addition, many new countries have come into their own on the international scene, have increased their literacy levels, and have produced published information that our scholars, advanced students, and officials must have access to. Furthermore, new methods for storing, organizing, and distributing information have come onto the scene or been markedly improved: computer transmission devices, and the like. At the same time the expansion of the American educational effort, at all levels, and both qualitatively and numerically, has sharply increased the numbers of institutions, students, and scholars requiring rapid access to complex and informational services.

Thus, information has increased in amount and complexity, the users have increased in numbers and sophistication, the pace of intellectual and social change has increased, and the technology has advanced in complexity and in cost. All of these factors have required a more effective and a speedier library and information service across the nation.

To help meet this need the Federal Government since 1956 has created an enlightened sequence of important legislation. Today, Federal library involvement is the responsibility of a great number of departments and agencies throughout the governmental structure. Moreover, the Federal Government in all of its parts is itself a primary producer, storer, and user of information and library services.

The very complexity, variety, and rapid pace of this important intellectual activity, involving as it does many jurisdictional levels (Legislative and Executive, local and national, as well as the private sector), are the basis for the proposal to establish a National Commission.

Such a body of distinguished citizens and eminent practitioners could give continuing and foresighted attention to the public interest in this important and pervasive field. It could rationalize and focus our present efforts, legislative and practical. It could engage in continuous long-range planning, setting goals and road maps for the future. It could rise above the special needs of particular groups or particular agencies and thus with impartiality see to the broad scope of public needs. It could ask the right questions and stimulate appropriate research. It could assist the Congress in designing new or remedial legislation, and it could help define the proper role of the several agencies and jurisdictions involved.

Another way to rationalize and resolve the present complexity might be to establish a central, monolithic administrative structure. This is the case in some other countries, such as France. However, in the American tradition, given the necessary and desirable involvement of private efforts together with governmental efforts at state and local as well as Federal levels, tight centralization is not acceptable. The wisdom and prestige of a distinguished National Commission would appear far more effective in our American setting.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, let me now suggest briefly just a few of the ways in which research libraries in particular need the continuous guiding assistance of such a Commission.

Most importantly, the nation needs overall policy guidance in deciding how—with proper planning, financing, and organizing—the store of research information can be made available to all qualified users. All across the country new community colleges are being established at a great rate. And across the country there are efforts to upgrade the quality of underpriviliged, often small, educational institutions, all with ambitious students and faculties. How, properly, can the capacities and expertise of the established research libraries be brought to these institutions and people, without overloading and thus reducing the quality of our greatest library and information centers? This is more than a matter of good will and more than a matter of technology. It is a subtle question of public policy involving several jurisdictions, including the independence of the universities involved.

A few years ago when I had the special privilege of being President of the 40,000-member American Library Association, I met with librarians, teachers, and friends of libraries from Alaska to Hawaii, and from Idaho to Pennsylvania. Everywhere there is a clear call for a better-organized national library and information service that will bring the best of modern services and facilities to all who need them.

Secondly, we are at a stage in history where the traditional academic fields must increasingly work together in multi-disciplinary research and teaching efforts. Scientists need to work with engineers, and both groups need to work with social scientists and humanists, in dealing with vital social problems. This puts a premium on a library and information service that is a seamless web, that is not segmented, particularly in academic institutions. I have the honor to serve on the Science Information Council of the National Science Foundation which advises NSF in its research support of information science. Recently, I also served in an advisory capacity to the National Library of Medicine as it began to develop regional medical libraries under the enlightened Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965. It is my opinion that while scientific and medical library services need continued improvement, the guiding intelligence of a National Commission could assure that other intellectual needs as well are served in parallel, that there are not gaps, and that there is proper interaction and compatibility rather than fragmentation or partial development.

Thirdly, we are long since convinced that we must serve the nation and that only through wise national involvement and planning is this feasible. In 1956 we moved toward multi-county library efforts and stronger state programs. At this crucial new stage in library history we must design a national library effort that is efficient as well as imaginative, farsighted as well as practical. To do this we require a mechanism that will strengthen and focus the best efforts of all of our libraries by establishing national goals and the wherewithal to achieve them.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am grateful for the opportunity to appear before you. I thank you, and respectfully urge prompt and favorable action on H.R. 8839 to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

POSITION STATEMENT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES' FEDERAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE ON THE REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES*

Since the members of the Association of Research Libraries have long been directly concerned with the Nation's library and information needs, they were heartened by the action of the President of the United States in September 1966, in appointing the distinguished National Advisory Commission on Libraries, chaired by President Douglas M. Knight of Duke University, to survey the library needs of the Nation and to make appropriate recommendations for action. The ARL now strongly supports the basic recommendations appearing in the Commission's recent summary Report.

During the last two decades a number of powerful social, technical, economic and intellectual forces have led to a mounting need for basic improvements and changes in library and information services throughout America. The postwar involvement of the Federal Government in scientific and technical research, the rapid expansion of education at all levels, the need for better international understanding, the so-called information explosion and the potentials of technology are but some of the forces at work.

---

*This position statement was adopted by the ARL membership, on January 26, 1969, as the official statement of the Association on the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries.

In response to these widespread needs and expectations, the Federal Government has increasingly sought ways to improve and strengthen library services for all the people. The result has been a sequence of important Federal legislation, beginning with the Library Services (and Construction) Act of 1956. Today Federal involvement, stemming from a variety of legislative acts, is the responsibility of a great number of departments and agencies throughout the governmental structure.

The Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries defines the scope of the national need and proposes a responsible mechanism for reviewing and coordinating the present wide range of critically important Federal efforts in support of libraries, as well as for the effective planning of any future efforts which may be undertaken. Further, it will assist in coordinating these Federal efforts with those of the States, the universities, the library associations and of many other institutions and organizations.

The Association of Research Libraries agrees that the most important measure which can be undertaken, and which should be undertaken immediately, is the establishment of a distinguished, well staffed and continuing Federal review, coordinating and planning mechanism. The ARL fully supports, therefore, the Advisory Commission in its proposal that the Congress and the President establish a permanent and influential National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. This Commission, properly located within the Federal Government, could be extremely helpful in advising the President, the Congress, the Federal agencies, and the many other state and private institutions on the priorities and measures required to establish and carry out a long-term program for the improvement of library and information services.

The ARL equally supports the Advisory Commission in its recommendation that the Library of Congress, in full recognition of its generous services and potential, be officially designated and supported as the National Library of the United States and that it be provided with a distinguished public board of advisors.

Similarly, the ARL endorses the Commission's recognition that there should be certain changes within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to enable the U.S. Office of Education to carry out the present and future library responsibilities assigned to it by the Congress.

The Association of Research Libraries, which consists of institutional representatives of seventy-nine major university libraries, privately established research libraries, and certain of the great Federal libraries, stands ready to assist and cooperate to the fullest in thus moving American libraries into a new era of national service.

Mr. VOSPER. I was pleased to hear Mr. Elliott's reminiscence of 1956 because I remember when I was in Kansas in those days what a heartening effect that bill had on service to youngsters and farm wives in rural communities in Kansas. I think that was a historic point in library history, fostered by the Congress and by your colleagues. And I am convinced now, sir, and gentlemen, that we have come to another major turning point when our focus must shift from rural and local and State areas to the total needs of the Nation.

This is why the proposal of H.R. 8839 seems timely, potent, and impressive.

From the point of view of the libraries that I represent, I would like to emphasize three areas in which such a Commission could be of particular help.

Most importantly, everybody in the Nation needs policy guidance at a high level in deciding how, with proper financing and planning, the total store of research information can be made available to all qualified users.

As all of you know, a great many new community colleges are being established across the country, new junior colleges, and new 4-year State colleges. We are trying hard to upgrade the quality of small and underprivileged educational institutions and somehow we need, with the guidance of a high-level Commission of this kind, to find out how this capacity and this powerhouse of knowledge and this expertise can appropriately be made available clear across the country to all users without depleting the capacities of the great research centers.

This, I would suggest, sir, is more than a matter of good will which we have. It requires a statement of public policy and guidance.

Secondly, as one of Mr. McDonough's predecessors as president of the American Library Association, I have been convinced through chatting with people clear across the country that this need is a national need. There have been superb developments in State organizations in New York State and Alaska, and I am pleased to say in my old home State of Kansas, but now this needs to be projected further.

From the point of view of large research libraries, a second particular point is important. In these days of serious social problems that the Congress and people must deal with, it is terribly important that all of the traditional academic fields work more closely together in what we call "multidisciplinary" work; that is, engineers and scientists need to work together with social scientists and humanists. This is coming about in universities.

In order to foster this multidisciplinary work, we need a complete unsegmented library and information service. And it is only through the guidance and support and fostering of a high-level national commission that this really can be brought to fruition.

I have emphasized the importance of the national scene. I think that, finally, is the third and most significant aspect of the potential of the National Committee.

Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, I think I have had my 3 minutes.

I would like to leave those points with you, together with the full statement, and my appreciation as a Californian that you, sir, are reading Mr. Nixon's campaign statement on the need of libraries into the record.

I would like to thank you for this opportunity to appear.

Mr. Brademas. Thank you, Mr. Vosper.

Mr. Overhage?

STATEMENT OF CARL F. J. OVERHAGE, DIRECTOR OF PROJECT INTREX, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Mr. Overhage. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I thank you for inviting me. I shall be brief.

My name is Carl Overhage. I am on the faculty of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. I serve as director of Project Intrex, a program of information transfer experiments directed toward the application of new technology in library operations. I was a member of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries.

There are many reasons for recommending the establishment of the statutory Commission on Libraries and Information Science. The distinguished witnesses who have preceded me before this subcommittee have put before you their insights concerning a very broad range of problems with which today's libraries are confronted. The more limited subject that I am prepared to discuss is the contribution that new technology may make to the solution of some of these problems.

The prospects are very bright indeed for large contributions from technical advances in microfilming and electrophotographic copying and in electronic data processing.

Experimentation with new technological approaches to library problems is going forward in universities, in industry, in local and State governments, and in the Federal Establishment.

What is lacking is a central agency for the development of a national plan that will give broad purpose and direction to these many activities. The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science proposed in H.R. 8839 is the first and most important step toward that end. The combined judgment of experienced librarians and engineers is needed to guide the application of new information transfer technology toward objectives that are consistent with national goals.

In addressing itself to that task, the Commission will have to deal with two widespread misconceptions concerning new technology in the library field. The first of these mistaken notions is that everything is known about how to use computers and display terminals in the library, that the equipment is ready and waiting on the manufacturers' shelves, and that its early use is retarded only by the unenlightened hostility of conservative librarians. Not so.

We need many more experiments and pilot operations to develop an understanding of the interactions between technically advanced library systems and their users.

The second misconception is that the ultimate objective of the new technology is the elimination of the printed page as a vehicle of information transfer. No so. The printed page will occupy an important position for a long time to come.

The proposed Commission will thus face an extraordinary challenge. It will have to reconcile the conflicting views of innovators and conservationists. It will have to plan for the most effective combination of what is promising in new technology and what is sound in established practice. At all times, the Commission will be aware that knowledge is power, and that access to knowledge must be one of the rights of free citizens. The recognition of that right and the judicious exploitation of new technology may enable the Commission to bring about the great resurgence of library progress that our society needs.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. **Brademas.** Mr. Overhage's statement will, without objection, be printed in full at this point.

(Mr. Overhage's prepared statement follows:)

STATEMENT BY CARL F. J. OVERHAGE, DIRECTOR OF INTREX, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: My name is Carl Overhage. I am on the faculty of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. I serve as director of Project Intrex, a program of information transfer experiments directed toward the application of new technology in library operations. I was a member of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries.

There are many reasons for recommending the establishment of a statutory Commission on Libraries and Information Science. The distinguished witnesses who have preceded me before this Subcommittee have put before you their insights concerning a very broad range of problems with which today's libraries are confronted. The more limited subject that I am prepared to discuss is the contribution that new technology may make to the solution of some of these problems.

Faced with the difficulties which the rapid growth of knowledge has inflicted on our libraries, it is natural for 20th-century Western society to seek solutions in its flourishing technology. The prospects are very bright indeed for large contributions from technical advances in microfilming and electrophotographic copying and in electronic data processing.

It is now possible, for example, to put large quantities of text on microphotographic records for compact storage and archival security. Low-cost duplicates of such records can be made on demand for users who wish to look at the material on microform readers in the library or elsewhere. Full-sized paper copies of individual pages can also be made on demand. These developments open the possibility that the lending of library materials will be largely superseded by the distribution of low-cost duplicates. Then the use of a particular library item by one reader need no longer preclude its concurrent use by others.

The images of text stored on microforms can also be transmitted over electrical circuits. One can visualize a procedure in which the user manipulates a keyboard to call up an item from the library's holdings. Images of successive pages of the selected item may be presented for brief examination on a screen; the push of a button will result in prompt delivery of paper or film duplicates of pages desired for protracted study or permanent retention. Access terminals of this type may be remote from the central information store; they may be geographically dispersed throughout a wide user community.

At the same terminals, access can be provided to a time-shared computer facility which contains the library's catalog and related bibliographic information in its magnetic memory. A teletypewriter dialog will lead the user to publications that are relevant to his interests. As these computer-communications systems come into general use, they will be interconnected to form regional and national information transfer networks, so that the resources available to each user will be enormously widened.

Experimentation with new technological approaches to library problems is going forward in universities, in industry, in local and state governments, and in the federal establishment. Only a few examples will be mentioned to illustrate the extent of the federal interest in this field: The Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, and the National Agricultural Library have taken important steps toward the utilization of computers in bibliographic services. The Atomic Energy Commission and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have been conspicuous among many federal agencies that have established technically advanced information systems for the dissemination of research results. Library research projects involving new technology have been sponsored by the Office of Education, and a broad range of projects directed at improved information transfers in science and engineering has been supported by the Office of Science Information Services. The Office of Science and Technology has taken on the task of coordinating the information programs of a number of federal activities; it has also sponsored a major planning study for a national document handling system in science and technology.

What is lacking is a central agency for the development of a national plan that will give broad purpose and direction to these many activities. The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science proposed in H.R. 8839 is the first and most important step toward that end. The combined judgment of experienced librarians and engineers is needed to guide the application of new information transfer technology toward objectives that are consistent with national goals.

In addressing itself to that task, the Commission will have to deal with two widespread misconceptions concerning new technology in the library field. The first of these mistaken notions is that everything is known about how to use computers and display terminals in the library, that the equipment is ready and waiting on the manufacturers' shelves, and that its early use is retarded only by the unenlightened hostility of conservative librarians. There has been some thoughtless overselling by enthusiastic engineers who had no adequate grasp of the complexity of library problems, just as there has been some thoughtless opposition by dedicated librarians, who failed to understand that the threat to the traditional regime was the flood of publication rather than the impact of technology. No such rhetoric will tell us how to plan wisely for the use of new technology. We need more experiments and pilot operations to develop an understanding of the interactions between technically advanced library systems and their users. Only by intelligent experimentation can we hope to provide a solid foundation for the design of future libraries.

The second misconception is that the ultimate objective of the new technology is the elimination of the printed page as a vehicle of information transfer. No competent engineer, however hard he may work on alternative approaches to information storage and display, believes that the extinction of the "Gutenberg galaxy" is just around the corner. What is really in prospect to libraries and information centers is an extremely fluid pattern of operations in which text is stored in a variety of forms, is easily transmitted to remote terminals, is displayed on screens or, at the option of the user, reproduced as print on paper. In this pattern, the printed page will occupy an important position for a long time to come. The problem will be to apply the new technology to reinforce rather than weaken the information transfer links that have been created in five centuries of printing.

The proposed Commission will thus face an extraordinary challenge. It will have to reconcile the conflicting views of innovators and conservationists. It will have to plan for the most effective combination of what is promising in new technology and what is sound in established practice. At all times, the Commission will be aware that knowledge is power, and that access to knowledge must be one of the rights of free citizens. The recognition of that right and the judicious exploitation of new technology may enable the Commission to bring about the great resurgence of library progress that our society needs.

Mr. Brademas. Mr. White?

STATEMENT OF HERBERT S. WHITE, PRESIDENT, SPECIAL LIBRARIES ASSOCIATION

Mr. White. As you requested, I will excerpt my remarks. I have submitted a full statement and I ask that that be included in the record.

Mr. Brademas. Without objection, so ordered.

(Mr. White's prepared statement follows:)

Prepared Statement by Herbert S. White, President,* Special Libraries Association

Mr. Chairman: The Special Libraries Association appreciates the opportunity you have offered to it to present its testimony on H.R. 8839, a bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. The Special Libraries Association was established in 1909, and has a present membership in excess of 7,000 individuals, primarily in the United States, with two Canadian Chapters. The membership of the Association is concentrated in libraries and information centers in business and industry, in governmental libraries and information facilities, and in specialized subject collections in universities and public libraries. The main emphasis of the Association and its programs over the 60 years of its existence is embodied in its slogan "putting knowledge to work." With this strong regard for meeting information requirements as they have developed, it will not be surprising to the Committee to learn that much of the developmental and pioneering implementation regarding new methods of storing and transmitting information, and regarding new and expanded services oriented to the direct needs of the library user, has come through our members in the libraries and information centers which they manage. While there is close coordination between ourselves and other associations in this field, most notably the American Library Association and the American Society for Information Science, the Special Libraries Association represents a unique and significant part of the profession concerned with librarianship and information science, and we appreciate the opportunity to be heard.

The Special Libraries Association considered the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries at meetings of both its Board of Directors and its Advisory Council in January of this year. After considerable discussion, the Board of Directors voted its endorsement of the Report, and specifically of its recommendation for the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. In view of this, we endorse the proposal of H.R. 8839 to establish such a Commission.

---

*Mr. White is also Vice President, Leasco Systems & Research Corp., Bethesda, Maryland.

In further discussion, the Board of Directors of the Special Libraries Association also expressed its support of the proposed establishment of a Federal Institute of Library and Information Science, and stated our strong interest in participating in the planning and implementation of this Institute. Additional feelings centered on what we felt were shortcomings and omissions in the initial report, not for the purpose of criticism, but rather with a positive view toward correction of any such deficiencies in contemplated legislation. In the specific comments I will now make I speak for myself as an individual, although, as President of the Special Libraries Association, I think I am reasonably cognizant of the interests in this regard of much of the membership. I will also, in the interest of the Committee's time, restrict my comments to those areas in which the Special Libraries Association can speak from a uniquely knowledgeable position, and will avoid repetition of our agreement with supporting testimony presented by other Library and Information Science Associations. This lack of comment, however, does not and should not be construed to imply lack of support.

I urge that in the establishment of the National Commission, in the selection of its membership, and in the delineation of its specific responsibilities, greater emphasis be placed on the interaction with and reliance upon special libraries and information centers, particularly as these occur in the private sector. The assumption is frequently made, and perhaps inadvertently perpetuated in the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, that most such specialized collections are small, that they serve only the limited body of information users within the organization, and that they draw heavily on the resources of public and university libraries. While such reliance and usage certainly does occur, it is only part of a two-way communication street. For many specialized disciplines, the great information resources are in fact located in specialized collections held by governmental agencies, non-profit foundations, and private corporations. A total effective nation-wide resource utilization program, such as I am sure is envisaged by the National Advisory Commission and by the sponsors of H.R. 8839, must take cognizance of the existence of these specialized collections, and must consider equitable means to draw them into the total resource.

A second point I would like to stress is the need for recognition, in the enabling legislation and in the charter and plan of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, of the fact that the libraries and information centers of our nation must deal with information and knowledge embodied in many forms, and must be able to deal successfully with these regardless of format. Books and periodicals are generally and immediately thought of as prime conveyors of information. The report literature, representing a more rapid and more informal method of presentation in response to urgent time pressures, is largely an outgrowth of World War II. Despite the popularity of this medium for a quarter of a century, little cognizance has been given to this significant method of information storage and transmission, and national consideration of this question has been noticeably and regrettably lacking. In addition, our libraries and information centers are, in increasing degree, relying on other forms of media, including audio-visual materials, slides, films, records, clippings, microfilm and other microforms, magnetic tapes and other formats for compressed storage and transmittal. None of these is in any way more or less significant than any other. What is significant is the fact that the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science must recognize its responsibility to deal with information in all formats, presently available and contemplated. Many of these information formats introduce problems and require an expertise in areas outside what has long been considered "traditional" librarianship.

I will perhaps startle the members of this Committee, when I state that, in my judgment, the most significant problem facing American libraries is not one of money. Having said this, let me quickly add that adequate financial support of library programs at all levels of our society is a critical requirement for the success of any National program, and the Special Libraries Association, and I personally, certainly support both the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission and of other witnesses in this regard.

The most significant problem, in my judgment, however, involves the investigation, determination, and implementation of programs for standardization, cooperation, and shared uitlization of materials and analysis. With the critical shortage of funds which all libraries and information centers face, much money is inefficiently allocated at the local level to redundant and overlapping efforts in ordering and processing because of a lack of standard approaches of universal acceptance. Selection programs are only beginning to take cognizance of other selection programs in cooperative endeavors, which might permit the acquisition of more materials which could be justified on a shared cost but not individual basis. Things are beginning to happen in this area but what has happened has only served to emphasize what can still be done and should be done. To a great extent, multiple and redundant intellectual analyses of acquired materials, where specialized approaches for a unique reader population cannot be justified, still take place, and the emphasis on materials acquisitions is still to a great extent on the construction of individual monuments of knowledge rather than on the total information requirements of the nation. One user's information requirements should be equally well served if his library does not have a specific item, but another library does and he can have access to it quickly and simply. President Johnson's charge to the National Advisory Commission on Libraries invited specific recommendations in this area, which the Commission was not able to give, largely because of pressures of time. It is essential that the proposed National Commission face these questions squarely and courageously. The problems posed are far from simple, and enter the sensitive area of potential government dictation and the freedom to read. Nevertheless, development of a national program, and investigation, development and implementation of the technological advances to make this possible, can only practicably come about through the Federal government, and it is my hope that the National Advisory Commission will consider this a matter of immediate priority. Since the technological developments to accomplish these objectives involve independent problems of complex magnitude, the establishment of a Federal Institute of Library and Information Science, to serve as the principal center for basic and applied research, as proposed in the report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, is considered as a matter of critical importance, to be implemented through proposed legislation as rapidly as possible. Much of the basic technology to accomplish national interactive networks exists. What does not exist are the applications design and engineering to produce equipment optimally designed for use in libraries and information centers, the cost analyses necessary, the Federal support needed to implement more experimental and pilot programs, and the Federal inducement to libraries to urge compliance. Such development is, in my judgment, crucial. Sharing of national resources cannot proceed very efficiently if it must depend on the manner in which the U.S. mails handle interlibrary loan packages

One further comment will address itself to the composition of the proposed National Commission. The problems concerning adequate library and information service for a nation are complex, and require an understanding of and deep involvement with the many factors which must be considered. A proposed limitation in the number of librarians and information specialists is, I think sound, although the limitation to one-third of the Commission membership is perhaps unduly constrictive. Most significant is the need, in the selection of membership with "special competence or interest in the needs of our society for library and information services", for the choosing of individuals who provide not just scholarship and dedication, but also some appreciation of the ramifications of present-day problems in information transmittal and usage. If this is not done, the Commission will again spend much of its time on a primer of familiarization, which will delay its work and limit its ability to reach direct conclusions and make specific recommendations.

The problems which confront our nation, in its need and striving to provide adequate and efficient library services to all of its citizens, are almost overpowering and their solution will require our very best efforts. It should not be inferred from what I have said earlier that the emphasis is primarily technological. It is more than that. What is needed is a total re-examination of the techniques and value systems which govern library service today—a re-examination, in the light of the needs of today's and tomorrow's societies, of the level of access to library materials to which our citizens are entitled, and of the adequacy and relevance of the information service which we supply. Our techniques and our standards have remained largely unchanged, while the society in which our libraries and information centers function has been altered drastically.

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science must spearhead these searching inquiries, and it is not difficult to presage a formidable and complex task. It is important that the legislation to establish this Commission clearly point to this challenge, as HR 8839 does, and that the Presidential appointees to the Commission be selected for their competence for and willingness to undertake such a major assignment.

As a final comment, I would like to re-emphasize our support of this legislation to give cognizance to this area of great national concern and responsibility. The Special Libraries Association, and its membership, pledges its cooperation and assistance in any manner in which this can be effectively rendered.

Mr. WHITE. The Special Libraries Association, which was established in 1909, has a present membership of 7,000 individuals. It is primarily concentrated in libraries and information centers in business and industry, in governmental libraries and information facilities, and in specialized subject collections in universities and public libraries.

The main emphasis of its programs over the 60 years is embodied in the slogan "putting knowledge to work."

With this strong regard for meeting information requirements, I think it would not then be surprising to the committee that our association has been very much involved in the developmental and pioneering implementation regarding new methods of storing and transmitting information.

We interact very closely with our sister associations, the American Library Association and the American Society for Information Science.

The board of directors of the Special Libraries Association considered the report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries at its mid-winter meetings in January at Rochester, N.Y., and voted unanimously to support the establishment of the permanent National Commission, as well as the establishment of the Federal Institute of Library and Information Science.

The points that we would specifically want to call to the committee's attention include the need for the recognition that special libraries, particularly as they exist in industry and in Government agencies, form a very, very important part of the information resources of our Nation.

It is sometimes automatically assumed that these libraries are small; that they are weak; and that they rely heavily on information from other libraries. In actuality, it is very much of a two-way process. Many of the special libraries' collections contain very unique information, and it is very important in considering the national resources for library information service that this be considered in its totality.

Furthermore, I think it is important that it also be recognized that when we talk in terms of libraries we are talking about many different kinds of materials for storage and transmittal of information. Books and periodicals are predominant and will continue to be predominant; slides, films, records, clippings, mircofilm, and other kinds of microforms, magnetic tapes, and others are all significant, and as significant.

It is our feeling, certainly that the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is of extreme importance.

The problems which this Commission will face, are many, and you have heard of some of them in other testimony.

There is certainly a great opportunity for coordination. The information in which we deal is very susceptible to coordination and to interrelated handling in processing, acquisition, and in usage.

Much of this, of course, raises questions of technology to which Dr. Overhage addressed himself. While these questions are not predominant, they are, nevertheless, very significant—not so much in the development of new technology, but rather of the adoption of existing hardware and ideas to the particular problems of libraries—and there are some unique problems involved.

For this reason we hope that one of the first things the National Commission would do would be to address itself to the need for a Federal Institute for Library Information and Science.

As a final comment, I would say that the need is for a strong commission at the Federal level, at the Presidential appointment level. I agree that there is overlap in the proposed Commission with existing Government programs and such agencies as the Office of Education and the National Science Foundation, but it is precisely because this kind of overlap exists that we do need a National Commission, a commission which is not an advisory commission, a commission which will have the power, the authority, and the ability to make recommendations of broad as well as of specific nature.

Mr. **Brademas.** Thank you very much, Mr. White.

Dr. Hayes?

STATEMENT OF DR. ROBERT M. HAYES, PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

Dr. **Hayes.** I am a member of the faculty of the University of California at Los Angeles. I have been in the data processing field for 20 years, in the application of computers to information, for over 10, in the use of computers, specifically on libraries and information service for the past five.

I would like to summarize my comments in my prepared statement and hope that the prepared statement will appear in the record.

Mr. **Brademas.** Without objection, so ordered.

(Dr. Hayes' prepared statement follows:)

Statement by Dr. Robert M. Hayes

I am Robert M. Hayes, Professor in the School of Library Service of the University of California at Los Angeles and Director of the Institute of Library Research of the statewide University of California. I am a past-president of the American Society for Information Science; I am President-elect of the Information Science and Automation Division of the American Library Association; and I am an Associate Editor (for Information Retrieval) of the *Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery*. As a professional, deeply committed to the application of information science to all areas of our society, I am here to register enthusiastic support of HR 8839.

The American Library Association, on whose behalf I speak today, is an educational organization of over 40,000 members. For nearly 100 years, it has worked for the creation of the finest possible library and information services to our country. As a member of the American Library Association, I am grateful for the opportunity to discuss with you what we feel will be landmark legislation. The governing body of the American Library Association adopted a resolution, as Mr. McDonough has stated, which supported the recommendations of the temporary National Advisory Commission on Libraries. In its report, that Commission crystallized a number of significant points about library and information services which I would like to emphasize today because of the importance they give to the proposed legislation.

First, as is the nature of our society, the institutions providing those services are of wide diversity. We have avoided the trap of a monolithic central agency and have created instead a strong collection of libraries, information centers, professional societies, commercial publishers, and federal agencies. The corresponding diversity of federal legislation amply demonstrates the extent of varied interests involved—the Library Services and Construction Act, the enabling legislation for NASA, the Medical Library Assistance Act, the Clearinghouse of Federal Scientific and Technical Information, the Higher Education Act (especially Title II and Title VIII), the State Technical Services Act, the Lister Hill Center for Bio-Medical Communications.

Second, those services themselves can be far more diverse than have been provided historically, including active dissemination, facsimile transmission, mechanized search and retrieval, publication, and complex information processing. The result has been a revolutionary expansion in the expectations of the people being served.

Third, the forms of storage of the data from which these services can be provided are vastly greater and more diverse than they have been before, including, in addition to printed books, journals, and reports, microforms, on-line digital stores, and digital and video magnetic tapes (such as those from the Bureau of the Census, the Library of Congress, Chemical Abstracts Services, etc.). Libraries and other information agencies have had to add capabilities to handle this greatly expanded variety of data.

Fourth, the population needing and demanding information services is vastly greater and more diverse than has historically been regarded as characteristic of the library user. The business man, the poor, the ill-educated, the student, the engineer, the scientist, the public administrator—each is expecting our national information systems to meet his needs.

Fifth, yet with all this diversity, and indeed richness, in potential information resources, library capabilities, and market for services, the National Advisory Commission on Libraries found grave deficiencies in the resources actually available—deficiencies of a staggering magnitude.

In a very real sense, the information field is at a point comparable to that of the railroad 90 years ago, the automobile 60 years ago, the airplane 30 years ago. The technology is here; the need is here; but the capital investment is beyond the capacity of any one of the institutions involved.

Specifically, we have many efforts already underway, directed at the development of information networks of a variety of kinds—joining libraries, information centers, and producers and users of information into smoothly working systems. These networks are going to involve major investments in equipment and expanded staff. We have many efforts already underway, directed at the use of mechanization in libraries and other information activities. These are already requiring major investments in equipment, in conversion of files, and in education of new kinds of staff. We have many efforts underway, directed at the distribution of new forms of data by publishers, professional societies, and federal agencies. These will require major investments to establish the data bases from which such products can be produced. It is in such a context that the proposed National Commission on Libraries and Information Science becomes especially important. We must have a focal point which will provide the coordination, direction, and definition of priorities on which far-seeing public policy can be based. We need the proposed National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as an agency free of specialized interests in the information field and capable of guiding how national investment can best be made in "information" as a national resource.

The proposed legislation has been especially perceptive in establishing the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as an independent agency. In this way, being independent of the separate constituencies, it can truly serve as a focal point and as an advisor on national policy. The functions assigned to it are appropriate to the nature of the problems involved and, indeed, are essential.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am grateful for the opportunity to appear before you. I thank you, and I respectfully urge prompt and favorable action on HR 8839. It will finally bring to a focus all of the scattered work of today and provide the essential direction for future national public policy.

Specifically there are three points which I want to emphasize. First, the desirability of continued diversity of interest; second, the need for clear-sighted national public policy; and, third, the need for adequate financial support for the Commission.

My comments derived from my own area of experience, computers and their use. But I feel that they apply equally to the broad spectrum of information work with which we are concerned here.

In my prepared statement I comment on diversity in a number of respects. I would like to comment specifically on the excellence of the work done to date by the Federal agencies, each within its own sphere of interest. And I think this will continue to be needed on into the future.

It is clear that the National Commission on Library and Information Science will not preempt these efforts. They are too important to the missions of the respective agencies.

But it is also clear that information is not limited in its value to compartmentalized interest. It has a common value and use to education, science, engineering, medicine, law, business and commerce, and Government.

The problem that we have been faced with over the past 10 years and longer has been how to achieve a rational, economically viable national system which will serve all of these interests.

None of the separate agencies has had the mission or resources to do so. Each has tried to view the problem in a larger context, but the very structure of governmental organization prevents them from doing so. It is this which makes the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science so vitally important and necessary, if a national policy is to be defined.

It is this which makes the proposed legislation, I feel, so perceptive in setting the Commission up as an independent agency, thus avoiding the limitations of identifying it with simply education or simply business or simply science. It is also clear that if this Commission is established as virtually an emasculated agency dependent upon the missionary agencies for its functional support, it would be worse than ineffective.

I think it would, in fact, delay the effect of what it is supposed to accomplish. It would create an illusion.

In my prepared statement I commented on the appropriateness of functions assigned to the National Commission by the legislation. I felt at the time I prepared my statement that the functions assigned were not only appropriate but nearly self-evident.

Therefore, I want to reiterate that the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science will need its own resources and its own ability to carry out its mission: not as a replacement, not as a substitute for the work of the other agencies, but in terms of its own requirement in establishing and defining national policy in this area.

Thank you very much for the opportunity of speaking to you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, Dr. Hayes.

Mr. Becker?

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH BECKER, VICE PRESIDENT, INTERUNIVERSITY COMMUNICATIONS COUNCIL

Mr. BECKER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I, too, shall abbreviate my remarks. I would also ask that my prepared statement be included in the record.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Without objection, so ordered.

(Mr. Becker's statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH BECKER VICE PRESIDENT, INTERUNIVERSITY COMMUNICATIONS COUNCIL (EDUCOM) BEFORE THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION CONCERNING H.R. 8839 APRIL 17, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: My name is Joseph Becker and I am Vice President of the Interuniversity Communications Council (EDUCOM), EDUCOM is a non-profit educational consortium of more than 100 institutions of higher learning. Its aim is to promote the extraorganizational communication of the university. It engages in numerous activities that are geared to accelerating information sharing among universities through the application of information science and the new communications technology. I am also current President of the American Society for Information Science (ASIS), a professional society of 3000 members which provides a forum for the advancement of information science and information systems in education, business, industry and government. Its constituents are concerned with all aspects of communicating, utilizing and storing digital and graphic information, and in developing information science as a strong professional activity in our national life.

My personal background and education has been in engineering, in librarianship and in the computer sciences.

I am very much in favor of establishing a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science; the need is clear and evident and action taken now would be very timely.

During its recent study, the National Advisory Commission on Libraries identified some very real and critical areas of national concern: a shortage of skilled library and information science manpower; the rising costs of information operations and library buildings; the growing information needs of an expanded, more literate and more mobile population; the increasing rate of publication; the emergence of many new forms of information storage such as; digital tapes, video tapes and micrographic forms; the impact of the new technology; the need for networks to interconnnect the great array of intellectual, scholarly, and research resources in our nation's libraries and information centers; and, the requirements for planning system's compatibility in order to achieve processing economy and provide a logical framework for future development. These are but a few of the challenges that confront the library and information science community today which we must face squarely and deal with intelligently.

Technical problems aside, however, the Commission also focused attention on the increasing independence which all segments of our society are placing on the use of information in their daily lives. Information is in constant use for personal recreation, for research, and instruction; it forms an integral part of activity in the home, office, on the farm, and at school; and its usefulness is shared by young and old alike. A reading of the Commission's report makes it abundantly clear that "information" is really a national asset and that henceforth it should be treated as such by the government.

In my opinion, the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as called for in H.R. 8839 is an essential first step towards reaching this goal for four principal reasons:

First, a permanent Commission can serve as a focal point in government to set policy and coordinate action. It is very logical for the federal government to assume this key role because it already is deeply involved in research and operating programs of major influence. It is also responsible for funding many information activities in education and in the private sector, through the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, the National Agricultural Library, and other federal units. A Commission can provide a workable framework to guide the development of the many existing and emerging federal programs.

Second, a permanent Commission can serve as a catalyst by bringing together the interdisciplinary expertise that is critical to the solution of information problems. I believe the library profession has much to give and gain through closer interactive ties with the computer industry, the communications industry, and other technological areas. In general, information science has up to now been more closely identified with the new technology than has librarianship. Linking the common interests of libraries and information science under the purview of a single Commission will do much to bring about closer professional collaboration and speedier adoption of the new technologies wherever practicable.

Third, a permanent Commission can serve as a mechanism for promoting changes in the library's role in society by accelerating network interconnection among libraries and information centers thereby removing the constraints of time and distance which formerly inhibited an individual's access to the totality of the nation's information resources. EDUCOM's network activities in higher education have revealed the dire need for new information packages and the opportunity for a user to share distant information resources through two-way interaction with the material.

Fourth, a permanent Commission can provide the context for desirable and urgently needed educational development within the field. Information science and librarianship are two sides of the same coin. An important need exists to provide the educational environment in which these combined professional interests can flourish. A Commission can provide the necessary support that will ensure the smooth and continuous development of the human resources and skills that are required.

In the United States, access to information is a public right but, a rapidly increasing population and a rapidly expanding universe of information is introducing more constraints and preventing the public from freely exercising this right. The object is to remove these impediments to knowledge by developing suitable mechanisms for facilitating the distribution and communication of information in all forms to all citizens. I believe the establishment of a permanent Commssion on Libraries and Information Science is the method by which this important national objective can be achieved.

Mr. BECKER. I am vice president of the Interuniversity Communications Council, EDUCOM, a nonprofit educational consortium of about 100 universities in the country who are interested in sharing resources through the new communications technology. I am also current president of the American Society for Information Science, which is composed of about 3,000 members and which provides a forum for the advancement of information science and information systems in education, business, industry, and government. Its constituents are concerned with all aspects of communicating, utilizing, and storing digital and graphic information. They are particularly alert to the new technology described by Dr. Overhage.

ASIS is eager to develop a strong professional information science activity in the Nation.

My personal background and education has been in engineering, in librarianship, and in the computer science. Essentially, I have lived in both worlds and I am delighted to see that information science and libraries are partners in the provisions of H.R. 8839.

I am very much in favor of establishing a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. I think the need is clear and quite evident that action is most timely.

During its recent study, the National Advisory Commission on Libraries focused on many problems that the information science community is very much aware of: shortages of skilled manpower in both libraries and information science, the growing information needs of an expanded, more literate, and more mobile population, and many others. All of these suggest the desirability of providing a plan for the growth of information resources of this country.

In my opinion, the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as called for in H.R. 8839 is an essential first step toward reaching this goal for four principal reasons:

First, a permanent Commission can serve as a focal point in Government to set policy and coordinate action. It is very logical for the Federal Government to assume this key role because it already is deeply involved in research and operating programs of major influence. It is also responsible for funding many information activities in education and in the private sector, through the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, the National Agricultural Library, and other Federal units. A Commission can provide a workable framework to guide the development of the many existing and emerging Federal programs.

Second, a permanent Commission can serve as a catalyst by bringing together the interdisciplinary expertise that is critical to the solution of information problems. I believe the library profession has much to give and gain through closer interactive ties with the computer industry, the communications industry, and other technological areas. In general, information science has up to now been more closely identified with the new technology than has librarianship. Linking the common interests of libraries and information science under the purview of a single Commission will do much to bring about closer professional collaboration and speedier adoption of the new technologies wherever practicable.

Third, a permanent Commission can serve as a mechanism for promoting changes in the library's role in society by accelerating network interconnection among libraries and information centers, thereby removing the constraints of time and distance which formerly inhibited an individual's access to the totality of the Nation's information resources. EDUCOM's network activities in higher education have revealed the dire need for new information packages and the opportunity for a user to share distant information resources through two-way interaction with the material.

Fourth, a permanent Commission can provide the context for desirable and urgently needed educational development within the field. Information science and librarianship are two sides of the same coin. An important need exists to provide the educational environment in which these combined professional interests can flourish. I think a Commission can provide the necessary support that will ensure the smooth and continuous development of the human resources and skills that are required to make this kind of partnership function effectively.

In the United States, access to information is a public right but, a rapidly increasing population and a rapidly expanding universe of information is introducing more constraints and preventing the public from freely exercising this right. The object is to remove these impediments to knowledge by developing suitable mechanisms for facilitating the distribution and communication of information in all forms to all citizens. I believe the establishment of a permanent Commission on Libraries and Information Services is the method by which this important national objective can be achieved.

Thank you very much for permitting me to testify.

Mr. Brademas. Thank you very much, Mr. Becker.

I thank all of you gentlemen for your very valuable statements.

Let me put a few questions to you that occur to me in light of your testimony. You needn't all comment unless you wish to.

The first one, however, is one that is generally directed to all of you. Does any of you have any quarrel with the proposition that the proposed National Commission should be independent of any existing agency of the Federal Government and, that its members should be appointed by the President?

You are all unanimous?

Mr. **White.** Very much so.

Mr. **Brademas.** A second point that I would touch on is one that runs through a number of your statements. That is the relationship between modern technology and libraries and information science generally. I know that 2 or 3 years ago I attended a conference at Brasenose College, the Brasenose College Oxford Conference on Automation of Libraries under the leadership of a very dear friend of mine, Robert Shackelton, who some of you know. I was struck by the fact that at this conference they were getting acquainted at least on the part of some of the delegates there, for the first time, librarians of the traditional kind and computer experts.

It became obvious that they needed to learn a common language.

To what extent, in light of some of the observations you have made, are we effectively moving ahead in the United States in this connection, to provide a dialog between automatic data processing specialists—I don't know how you generalize them—and traditional librarians?

Mr. **Becker.** Recently, the American Library Association, formed a new division called an Information Science and Automation Division. It took this action because it recognized the influence which technology would have on libraries and the importance of bringing this gap that you describe so well. Within the computing associations, like the Association of Computing Machinery, special interest groups on library automation have been established. Dialogs are taking place on both sides today. In recent months, the Special Libraries Association and the American Society for Information Science have held preliminary merger discussions, because we, too, recognize the importance of bridging the technology gap and the desirability of educating a new breed, people who feel comfortable and competent in both fields.

Mr. **Brademas.** Do I take it that one of the activities that you would like the Commission to undertake would be to encourage that kind of thing?

Mr. **Becker.** Absolutely.

Mr. **McDonough.** If I may comment on that new division that Mr. Becker mentioned of the American Library Association. The fact that it attracted about 3,500 members right at the beginning is an indication, I think, of the widespread interest in this throughout the profession, and we are focusing on this topic much more than we have in the past.

Mr. **White.** I would only add a comment, if I may, that there is a great deal of activity going on in this area, as Mr. Becker indicated. For those of us who are very closely involved in this, and I am as both a librarian and as an information specialist, certainly it is not as rapidly as it ought to be. That is one of the things the Commission could and should accelerate. Both the Special Libraries Association and the American Society for Information Science are now affiliated with the American Federation of Information Processing Societies, the best available means for dialog. There is dialog taking place. On virtually all major university campuses the library staff now includes a data processing specialist librarian.

If we are going to handle vast increases of information and greater detail of information access, something our citizens require, we will have to make greater utilization of our technology in library programs.

Mr. **Vosper.** Could I just add one comment to this, Mr. Chairman, that springs from something Mr. White said. Let me say that my colleague, Professor Hayes, you have heard his background as a specialist in the computer systems development, the last few years, has come on to the academic scene where he teaches in the Library School at UCLA. And there the intention that we hope for is that in the future we can train librarians who have an understanding of data processing and computer technology.

Mr. **Hayes.** There are a large number of library schools that are moving in this direction and have included people from the data processing fields as members of their faculty and even as deans of the library schools. And I must comment on the great value in this respect of the Higher Education Act, title IIB, which has fostered the growth of this kind of program in library schools. It has been under the administration of the Office of Education, and is a remarkably useful aid to accomplishing exactly this purpose.

Mr. **Brademas.** I regret to have to report, Dr. Hayes, that the title in which you made reference is likely to be far less useful in the coming months, if the administration has its way.

I don't know if you are aware, gentlemen, of the President's budget recommendations in the field of library resources, but since they just came out and since we have such a distinguished gathering of authorities as yourselves in front of one of the subcommittees of the committee that has the authorizing authority over this legislation, let me tell you some of the major areas of the Presidential recommendations.

The comparisons I am about to make are between President Johnson's budget requests and President Nixon's requests of this week.

President Johnson recommended $42 million for title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. President Nixon recommended nothing. That is to say not a penny.

In respect to the Library Services and Construction Act, to which reference has been made on a number of occasions this morning, President Johnson recommended $49,894,000; President Nixon recommended $23,209,000, or a cut of more than 50 percent.

Included in the Library Services and Construction Act budget requests were the following two items of interest, for title I, President Johnson requested $35 million for title I public library services. Mr. Nixon requested $17½ million or exactly half of that.

The Johnson request for title II, that is public library construction was $9,185,000; President Nixon asked for nothing.

Turning to the third and final area the Higher Education Act, President Johnson recommended for title II, which is college library assistance and library training and research, $42,606,000; President Nixon, $23 million.

And as part of that, with respect to part A, college library resources, the Johnson budget called for $25 million; the Nixon budget $12½ million, or half.

And with respect to part B, to which Dr. Hayes just made reference, that is library training, the Johnson budget recommended $8,250,000; the Nixon budget, $4 million, or less than half.

And part C, acquisition and cataloging for the Library of Congress, President Johnson recommended $7,356,000; and President Nixon, $4,500,000.

Indeed, you may be interested to learn that 25 percent of all of President Nixon's proposed cuts in programs operated by the Office of Education were in the field of library programs.

Now, I must say in all candor, and I have just received this information within the last 30 minutes, so I had really not come in here prepared to make this observation. I am, as one member of this committee, deeply alarmed, not to say shocked, by such recommendations as these, because at a time when the country is giving itself to a consideration of national priorities, I think it is quite clear where, in spite of President Nixon's letter written when he was Vice President, his priorities are.

All I want to say is they are not my priorities, as one member of this committee. I think maybe what we need is less attention to the ABM and more attention to ESEA. That is my view.

And after that sermon, I will invite you to make any comments any of you may wish to make.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the hearing record, the tables from which these figures have been taken.

	Nixon revised budget recommendation	Johnson January budget recommendation
Elementary and Secondary Education Act; Title II: School Library Resources, Textbooks, and Other Instructional Materials	0	$42,000,000
Library Services and Construction Act	$23,209,000	49,894,000
Title I: Public Library Services	17,500,000	35,000,000
Title II: Public Library Construction	0	9,185,000
Title III: Interlibrary Cooperation	2,821,000	2,281,000
Title IVA: State Institution Library Services	2,094,000	2,094,000
Title IVB: Library Services to the Physically Handicapped	1,334 000	1,334,000
Higher Education Act: Title II: College Library Assistance and Library Training and Research	23,000,000	42,606,000
Part A: College Library Resources	12,500,000	25,000,000
Part B:		
Library Training, Including Institutes	4,000,000	8,250,000
Reserach	2,000,000	2,000,000
Part C: LC Acquisition and Cataloging	4,500,000	7,356,000

Mr. McDonough. We are as shocked as you are, sir. Naturally, I am shocked at the national implications. I had a conference with my staff who helped me administer two of those programs to which you refer, the title II ESEA and the Library Services and Construction Act. And the affects on my particular State will be disastrous. We have made simply tremendous gains, of the kind that Mr. Elliott spoke to, in the years that these programs have been in existence. For example, hundreds of elementary schools have been started, improved, staffed; where there were no librarians, there are now librarians. And I am speaking of the nonpublic schools as well as the public schools.

And if we truly believe in educational opportunity, then obviously we have got to insure that every child has access to the materials of learning. This is what our educational program is really all about. We have not yet had time, Mr. Chairman, to prepare a formal statement about what these cuts will mean to libraries on the national scale, but we will be producing a statement within a few days.

Mr. **Brademas**. I would hope, sir, that you would get that information to the Members of the House of Representatives and Senate.

Mr. **McDonough**. I think I can assure you, sir, that this will be forthcoming from all parts of the country.

Mr. **Brademas**. If no one else has any comment on that, I am going to turn to two more quick questions and yield to my colleagues.

Reference was made to a Federal Institute of Library and Information Science. I wonder if one of you who is familiar with that proposal, although it is not part of the bill before us, would explain what that recommendation of the Advisory Commission entails.

Does anybody know what that is?

Mr. **Overhage**. The National Advisory Commission on Libraries made the recommendation that a Federal Institute of Library Science and Information Technology be established to provide a Federal center for research and development efforts in this field. There was much discussion on the mechanism by which such an institute might operate. And I think the model that was on the mind of many members of the Advisory Commission was that of a federally sponsored, privately operated institution.

There are many prototypes of successful operations of that kind. If it is to come to existence, I think it would constitute the operating arm of the National Commission that we are discussing here this morning. It would become a center of competence under Federal supervision to provide the technological implementation of the kind of planning we are talking about this morning.

Mr. **Brademas**. Do I take it that most of you, in light of what you said, would not agree with the suggestion made yesterday that the activities of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science should be confined to advisory activities as distinguished from providing technical assistance and promoting research development which are among the activities contemplated in the bill?

Mr. **Overhage**. Speaking only for myself, I would view the proposed National Commission as the focal point of national planning in the area of library science and information science. And I would, therefore, view it in a role that is very much stronger than what I would understand to be the role of an advisory commission.

Mr. **Brademas**. Are all of you in agreement with that position.

Mr. **White**. Yes.

Mr. **Becker**. Yes.

Mr. **Vosper**. Yes.

Mr. **Overhage**. Yes.

Mr. **McDonough**. Yes.

Mr. **Hayes**. Yes.

Mr. **Brademas**. My last question is this: I note in the papers submitted by the Association of Research Libraries on the report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries that there is a paragraph saying that the ARL endorses the recognition by the Commission that there should be certain changes within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to enable the U.S. Office of Education to carry out the present and future library responsibilities assigned to it by the Congress.

Can you explain to us what that dark and murky statement means?

Mr. **Vosper.** I think I could say, briefly, sir, that librarians have long felt that information and library interests are not well served in HEW. They have been submerged far down within the large structure of the Department to the point where many times it has been difficult to gain the recognition required, the high level staffing required and the full attention of the agency. I think this is indicative of why we feel very strongly that the permanent National Commission must exist at a high level of Presidential appointment, rather than being submerged in any one of the operating agencies which would have a stake in the activities of the Commission.

Mr. **Brademas.** One very quick final question. To what extent are people in the emerging computer and information technology field, represented by the phrase "information sciences," aware, as quite clearly librarians, more traditionally defined, are aware of this kind of legislative proposal, and to what extent are they as interested, as clearly all of you are, or you wouldn't be here today?

Can one of you, perhaps maybe Mr. Becker, from your perspective, you can comment on that. Is my question clear?

Mr. **Becker.** Yes, I think so, Mr. Chairman.

I am not quite sure how clearly they perceive the implications of this proposed legislation in terms of their own interest and needs. I suspect that they do not perceive it clearly, only because of the fact that communication among the different segments of this interdisciplinary community is not as effective these days as it might be.

Mr. **White.** There is still a great deal that needs to be done. The interrelationship between the library and information scientist and the technologist is a two-way problem, because as librarians need to be more familiar with technology, I think certainly our technologists tend to reach simplistic conclusions about how to handle information problems. They are certainly not as aware of the complexity as they ought to be, and I know that both Mr. Becker's association and mine are working very hard in this particular direction.

I would hope, again, that the National Advisory Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and specifically including information science, would include in the scope of its work the bringing together of technologists and librarians for this meaningful interchange.

Mr. **Brademas.** Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Mr. **Brademas.** Mr. Steiger?

Mr. **Steiger.** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will not belabor a point about Mr. Nixon's budget.

Mr. **Brademas.** I should think not.

Mr. **Steiger.** With all due respect to our beloved chairman, we can, I think, keep this on a more appropriate level.

I am, of course, concerned, as I think all people are who have any interest or thoughtful consideration on the problems of this country, about what it is we have to do in attempting to mix and match the differing needs and priorities which every group has. And I am concerned about the reductions in funding availability as recommended by the President, as I was concerned about the reductions in the funding of the budget submitted by Mr. Johnson in certain areas.

I don't know that any one President or any one party is more subject or less subject to criticism by special interest groups insofar as the budget is concerned.

Given the fact that all of you have made first-rate statements and very helpful statements to this committee, buttressing arguments to why this Commission ought to be established there still are some points about which I would ask some questions.

Mr. White, in your statement you indicate on page 3 that you may startle the members of this committee when you say that, in your judgment, "the most significant problem facing American libraries is not one of money."

Then going on you say that adequate financial support of library programs at all levels is quite a critical requirement of the national program. And then you further say that it is your considered judgment that the most significant problem involves the investigation, determination, and implementation of programs for standardization, cooperation, and shared utilization of materials and analysis.

Could you explain more in that vein, because this raises, frankly, a question to which I would like all of you to direct your attention after Mr. White comments on the question of funding. What do we now do as contrasted to what we have to do, recognizing the amount of information that is now available. To simply continue with that system we now use, in fact, may put us back further than if we utilized the Commission to develop the new approach that needs to be used.

Mr. WHITE. Let me try to put that into context. I certainly would not want to imply that I do not actually support the requests for funding that have been submitted and have been endorsed by the other library associations' spokesmen. At the same time, and, again, I am speaking personally here, I think we sometimes tend to think in terms of solutions of all our problems in terms of money. If we just had enough money, we could do all kinds of things. I think that is an oversimplification.

One of the things that is particularly significant is that when we are talking about the use of information resources in the United States, we are really talking in very large part about the use of the same kind of things in a great many different places.

A particular book, as an example, can be obtained in literally thousands of communities and thousands of public libraries in the Nation. A great deal has been done in the area of cooperation, shared cataloging programs, programs for cooperative acquisitions, the kind of program in which two large libraries in the same geographical area agree, "Neither of us is going to build a separate monument. We will build it together. You contribute in one area and we will contribute in the other."

This is an effective way of utilizing resources which will always be limited. In the acquisition and in the selection, processing, and distribution of information, there is a great deal more that can be done in the manner we proceed. I consider this a very important and very significant function of the Commission, perhaps in that sense more important than its function in defining the need for more Federal funds in support of libraries, but only more important in that context.

Mr. Steiger (presiding). Do any of you wish to comment on that proposition.

Dr. Hayes?

Dr. **Hayes**. I agree completely with the import or implications of what you say. I wouldn't be where I am if I didn't, in a library school trying to teach data processing and systems techniques as they would apply in the library and information service field.

There is one addition that I would like to make, however. The library is an existing institution and in order to get where we want to go we have to start from where we are. One of the most important things that I see the National Commission doing is establishing the priority in progression from where we are to the future, so that we don't deal with revolutions in technique which wouldn't function and won't work well at all. But rather we should move with a very carefully planned progression of stages from our libraries and information services of all kinds, the professional societies, the publishers, the Federal agencies that are involved, from where these are now to an integrated, smoothly functioning program.

I think that this really is the primary thing that the National Commission can do: to encourage the things that we have not been able to do to date because of the fragmented character of research. The National Commission, with a research program based on its own mission of a national system, I think, can meet this need for planned progress.

Mr. **Steiger**. I appreciate your comments.

Mr. Becker, do you want to add anything?

Mr. **Becker**. No, sir.

Mr. **Steiger**. All of you have made comments in response to the chairman's question of the problem of location as well as statute. I agree, as I am sure you know, that the Commission ought to be Presidentially appointed. I think that has a great deal of justification. I am not as yet convinced, that it is equally important that it be independent. The approach that I have preferred is that it be established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, not to be bogged down with the problems of where we are now in HEW—and I do agree about that problem as I do about vocational education; both of these I think are down played.

We have a situation, however, in which there are something like a thousand or more separate and distinct Federal agencies, bureaus, departments, commissions, and the like. Now, that, to me, poses as great a problem as where we are and what we do about this group.

If we simply create a Commission appointed Presidentially on the justification that, therefore, it will be "independent"; I really question whether it is independent or whether, in fact, it is lost. So I would ask of you to now give me what reasons you see as the value of simply an independent commission, all of us agreeing that it should be appointed by the President.

Why is it necessary? What is the justification for not having it as part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as contrasted to having it being an independent commission.

Mr. **White**. First of all, obviously a commission which is lost is no good to anyone. The Commission, no matter where established, even if it is established within one of the existing departments, will require encouragement and support by the executive branch as well as the congressional legislation to enact it into being. My own reason for thinking that this would be more effective on an independent basis is my own personal realization, that the task of this Commission will interact very clearly and very necessarily with information programs which already have been established within various Government agencies funded by other programs. It must do this. I can very clearly see a very definite need for interaction and relationship with the National Science Foundation, with the various national library programs, the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, and the National Agricultural Library. I see the necessity for interacting with the information programs operated by such agencies as the Department of Defense and NASA. We don't think of these as libraries, but I assure you they serve many of the same functions.

The Commission must interact on an interdepartmental level, and it would seem to me, although I am not an expert in the way these things function, that it would be easier for it to do this if it were not directly related to a specific department of the Federal Government, which had its own priorities and own directions which would predominate over those of the Commission.

Mr. McDonough. I am sensitive to what you are saying about the proliferation of the agencies, Mr. Steiger. And I can understand your concern about that. I am not worried about the Commission getting lost, however. It seems to me that if the President were to appoint the kind of people that you really need on a Commission of this level that they will be heard, sir. I think their task is sufficiently important so that their recommendations for programs and so forth would get to the Presidential ear. There is another point, to pick up something that Mr. White said, it is a bit awkward, I think, to have a Commission of this kind located within an executive agency when, really, will be intimately concerned with the role of an agency of the Congress, meaning the Library of Congress, which is an absolutely essential agency to overall library development in this country.

And I think that because of the library information needs transcend the executive department and so on that it should be an independent agency.

Mr. Steiger. One might then suggest that it be attached to the Library of Congress?

Mr. McDonough. One could. But only for rations and quarters, perhaps, as we used to say in the service.

Mr. Steiger. As you know, it is provided in this bill, in H.R. 8839, that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will provide the rationing and services. Is there justification for that or should we provide for the Library of Congress to do that?

Mr. McDonough. I don't know whether I am qualified to pass judgment on that. But the important point is, I think, to maintain its authority and responsibility to higher authority and this is what I am deeply concerned about.

Mr. Steiger. May I say, Mr. McDonough, that that argument was the argument used when the Office of Economic Opportunity was created in the Office of the President. OEO hasn't had very much success in its roles of coordination, of evaluation, and of attempting to work with other departments and agencies, partly perhaps because it lost its support of the President after a while. But that is another matter.

Mr. OVERHAGE. I would like to support the argument for independence of the Commission by pointing out that one of its functions will have to be the determination of which branches of the Federal establishment will do what in the library and information science field. There is a proliferation of effort now and the total pattern in the Federal establishment is confused at the present time. One of the things to which we would look in this Commission is to straighten out these matters and determine more clearly what parts of this vast problem should be handled by what agency.

Now, it seems to me that function will be difficult for the Commission to accomplish if it is within the structure of one of the competing organizations.

Mr. STEIGER. Did the Knight Commission consider the question of asking the Library of Congress to provide the administrative services?

Mr. OVERHAGE. I have no recollection that they did. Of course, the Knight Commission was administratively supported by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But this was in the sense of providing rations not in the sense of being part of the structure of HEW.

Mr. VOSPER. Might I comment briefly on the whole question of stature. There already exists a number of advisory committees and commissions on library and information matters within a number of the Federal agencies, the National Science Foundation, HEW, et cetera. But none of them, really, has the overall capacity to bring the totality of the problem into focus. This is, I think, what you, sir, and we are aiming at.

Mr. OVERHAGE. I am not suggesting that making the Commission independent in itself will guarantee the success of the Commission. A great deal will depend on the chairman and the members.

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Collins?

Mr. COLLINS. I am inclined to agree with my colleague from Wisconsin. You are so impressed with a number of commissions and operations in Washington, the first thing that comes up when you talk about another one, you wonder about it. One thing, I am wondering about in the library field, do you know of any specific suggestions as to how we could consolidate the present bureaus? This wasn't brought up in this Commission. Because we are talking about starting another one. I don't know how many we have now. How many different Federal bureaus do we have on the subject of working on libraries now?

Mr. VOSPER. I would think, Mr. Collins, that this clearly is one of the many important reasons why we need a National Commission of high stature to concern itself with the proper coordination, consolidation, and focusing of effort. This is a problem that only such a Commission can deal with within the totality of the very complex Federal structure. I think we are all aware of the basis for your question and we look to such a Commission to propose rational and feasible action.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I would have said much the same thing, sir.

Mr. WHITE. Each of the Federal departments and independent agencies in support of its own activities has its own information program, its own library. And it is quite proper that it do this. And, of course, it takes the responsibility for a subject field as spelled out by the charter and programs of that particular agency. It is also natural that each of these agencies would try to evolve a fairly sophisticated system of its own.

There is coordination, and I would be very remiss to say there is not. There is coordination in program planning and in the interchange of information. Nevertheless, I think the implication of what we are all saying is that there is a great deal more than can be and needs to be done in focusing not only on these various Federal programs but in tying them to non-Federal programs, particularly at the public, university, professional society, and industrial level, to tie all of them into a total viable resource.

Mr. COLLINS. Have you all made a proposal about the consolidated suggestion? In fact, you have enough associations of your own.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I would like to call your attention, Congressmen, to the fact that in recent years there has been an attempt to bring about some coordination of Federal library activities. Mr. Paul Howard, in the back of the room, is executive secretary of the Federal Library Committee and this group is working together to try to cut out duplications in this field. He is headquartered in the Library of Congress and I do call that to your attention, sir. They are not going on strictly on their own.

Mr. COLLINS. That is all I have.

Mr. BRADEMAS (presiding). I have just a couple of other questions before we adjourn.

I would be interested if someone who is knowledgeable in this field would comment about the potential for the use of microfiche. I am aware that the Encyclopaedia Britannica has just come out with a commercial venture that involves—that is not a plug by the way—I am aware that they have done this in the field of American history, I believe, and others have told me that it is within the realm of possibility that for a relatively modest outlay of moneys it would be possible just looking ahead a few years, to supply, by use of the microfiche technique, most of the underdeveloped areas of the world with libraries in a relatively short space of time containing at least most books published, let's say, since the start of this century. Do you have any general comment on that?

Mr. BECKER. If I may, sir. The program of the Encyclopaedia Britannica is concerned with American history. I think it embraces pre-1914 or 1917 materials and involves the recording on 4 by 6 sheets of film, called microfiche, some 20,000 volumes which would then be available for sale at roughly $15,000 per set. The cost of filming the material is the greatest single expense in the entire arrangement and it is only feasible to do this if there is a reasonable expectation of a market that would recoup the cost of the initial filming.

Now, in addition, there is the copyright problem. I understand that Encyclopaedia Britannica intends to film material which is in the public domain.

A critical requirement also exists for a reader, a portable reader, one that you could use on your lap, of low cost and operable with low voltage.

Several firms in the country are considering the development of microbook programs, working out arrangements with publishers in order to provide appropriate reimbursement to authors for use of copyrighted material. It all hinges on two things: One, the technical requirement for a portable reader and two, some systematic approach to the market in order to make the original filming of the material economically feasible.

Mr. **Brademas.** I should have thought, without being any expert on it, that in respect of U.S. foreign aid programs—and I note on the part of both Republicans and Democrats in the House, an increasing interest in concentrating on education, that this might well be the kind of support that the United States could afford in these underdeveloped countries that would be of relatively low cost with a terrific payoff ultimately.

Mr. **Vosper.** May I, Mr. Chairman, just draw to the attention of your committee that there will soon be published a volume issued by the MIT press called "On Reseach Libraries" and this stems from the deliberations of the Advisory Commission on Libraries. That Commission asked Dr. Burkhardt's group—you heard Dr. Burkhardt on Tuesday—to give particular attention to research libraries. Within that volume there is a special study on automation undertaken by Bell Telephone engineers. They focus rather specifically on the complexity and difficulties of the variety of microform, microfiche, microfilm, et cetera, now being produced and pose a question that the national Commission must deal with; namely, that in this field, too, there is such a variety that we need a thoroughgoing systems analysis of the impact on the user of these products. This we really don't have at this point in time, and we need it very much. We should be sure, if we produce microfiche packets for people in underdeveloped countries, that they can use them, they can find what they want, they can get the readers, and that the device will really work in a social situation.

On many of these questions, there is uncertainty at this time.

Mr. **McDonough.** To pick that up, sir, this affects the Government printing program which is, as you know, working toward standardization in this field and could be aided by a national commission which is looking at the totality of library and information services.

Mr. **Brademas.** Mr. Overhage?

Mr. **Overhage.** I think, Mr. Chairman, the technical potential of what you outlined definitely is there. Photographic technology is available to have this large-scale distribution of materials at a low cost. What we don't know yet is how, on a large scale, people will accept the notion of examining text on readers. Now, this has been done successfully in a number of operations. As you know, the Federal Establishment is now distributing micorfiche in pretty fair quantities. The users are generally people who look for some specific information and who do not examine the material at very great length. They look up a specific fact. But we are talking about something else in these large distribution schemes, particularly if we talk about the underdeveloped countries, there we are talking about students and others spending many hours in studying. How they will perform with inexpensive microfilm readers which have not yet been developed is still an open question.

It is one of those questions that needs experimentation very urgently. It is typical, I think, of a question that the national Commission would push very hard.

Mr. **Brademas.** Yes; I should have thought it is a good instance, in my own mind, of a library and information problem with profound implications for foreign policy, for instance, that is a problem that would go far beyond the concern of a particular user within the Federal Government for libraries.

Just two other questions and I will ask Mr. Hansen if he has any questions.

Nobody said anything in here, and maybe that means something, about the role of the National Archives. I have noted a book has just been published on that subject within the last few weeks.

Does anybody know anything about that?

Mr. **McDonough.** My official title is director, division of the State library archives and history. We are a combined agency obviously, and one of the more integrated from the standpoint of the functions of the State library agencies in the country. And clearly archival functions must not be lost sight of in terms of this Commission's responsibility. They are so intimately connected that they deserve to have a great deal of attention paid to them.

Mr. **Brademas.** Does anyone know the relative—this is a radically different question—the relative percentage of support for libraries and information science—I suppose it would be easier to simply use the category of libraries—from local, State, and Federal Governments and from private resources in this country?

Are such statistics available in any intelligible way?

Mr. **McDonough.** I guess the answer, sir, is not at the tip of the tongue. But they are available and pretty good statistics can be produced on this.

Mr. **Brademas.** Mr. Hansen has been busy at the White House and may have something to tell us.

Mr. **Hansen.** First let me apologize for being unavoidably detained and for not being present during the testimony. I would only add my appreciation to that of which I know the chairman has expressed for the presence of this distinguished panel here this morning to assist us in the development of this legislation. I have the prepared statements which I will read with great interest.

Mr. **Brademas.** Thank you once again. If anyone has any other points he wants to make now is the time.

Mr. **Vosper.** I would just like to affirm what Mr. McDonough said and say once again that Dr. Burkhardt's special committee concerned with research libraries did deal with the whole archival question and with the full conviction that this is part of the total package without any questions. And one would only hope that that phrase, that specific word, might get into the legislation.

Mr. **Brademas.** Again, gentlemen, I want to express my own appreciation and that of all the members of our subcommittee to all of you for your most valuable and illuminating testimony.

This concludes the public hearings on H.R. 8839. In addition to the testimony that we have received from the witnesses today and earlier this week, we have in the subcommittee files a number of statements and letters with respect to this legislation and without objection they will be made a part of the printed hearings record as will appropriate statements that are received during the next 10 days.

I shall be advising the members of the subcommittee of the time and place for markup sessions.

The subcommittee now stands in adjournment, subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 12 noon, the subcommittee adjourned.)

APPENDIX

(Following are letters and other documents ordered to be made a part of the hearing record.)

National Academy of Sciences,
National Academy of Engineering,
Washington, D.C., April 8, 1969.

Hon. John Brademas,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Brademas: Enclosed are excerpts from the final report of the Committee on Scientific and Technical Communication (SATCOM) of the National Academy of Sciences-National Academy of Engineers. These enclosures include portions of the SATCOM final report that are relevant to the Bill to Establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

SATCOM sees no conflict in the basic import of the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries and its own philosophy and recommendations. Further, we believe that the coordinating commission that we propose within the structure of the Academies and the one proposed by the National Advisory Commission on Libraries could complement and supplement one another's efforts, and that there is ample need and scope for the activities of both proposed bodies. We also believe that those aspects of the information problem that transcend the library problem can be most effectively handled by the type of coordinating mechanism we recommend.

Chapter 2 of our report (see Enclosure A) presents our basic thinking and a summary of the topics treated in our recommendations. Two sections of Chapter 3 (see Enclosure B) present our recommendations on libraries and our comments on the report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. Chapter 10 (see Enclosure C) describes in detail the Joint Commission on Scientific and Technical Communication, responsible to the Councils of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering.

If further information on our report and recommendations is needed or appropriate, I will be glad to provide it.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Cairns,
Chairman,
Committee on Scientific and Technical Communication.

Enclosure A

Chapter 2

A Summary of SATCOM's Thinking and Recommendations on Scientific and Technical Communication

A. BASIC PRINCIPLES

A primary concern throughout our survey was to relate the complex network of scientific and technical communication activities to the environment that has shaped it, supports its current operation, and will influence the course of its future development. A variety of factors affect and, in turn, are affected by patterns of scientific and technical communication. These include:

1. The education, objectives, and work habits of those who guide or participate in the conduct of science and technology
2. The missions, resources, and intellectual authority of the organizations and institutions that establish policies, set standards of performance, and determine the allocation of resources

3. The emergence of new technological and procedural tools

The philosophy that we have developed during our three years of existence accords with and builds upon that expressed in the earlier reports of the Baker and Weinberg Panels (Refs. 14 and 170, respectively). Our philosophy also has been strongly influenced by the extraordinary diversity of the things we have learned about information services and systems and about the needs and aspirations of those whom they serve. This diversity, of which we hope the reader will get at least a taste in Chapters 4 through 9, can be bewildering, yet at the same time filled with opportunities, and it is the latter aspect that has impressed us most.

Our recommendations reflect our effort to stimulate recognition of some of the major opportunities and acceptance of responsibility for action. For example, we have tried to challenge the *scientific and technical societies* to appreciate the crucial role they must play and have pointed to some specific areas in which they can take steps to fulfill this role. We have emphasized to *sponsors of research and development* that such work is of value only when the results are accessible and capable of being adapted to the contexts in which they can be applied. In other words, the sponsors' responsibility for such work includes whatever steps are appropriate (patent, publication, announcement, etc.) and necessary to assure its availability.

We have pointed to the *feasibility and necessity of serving special user groups* (each numbering a thousand or so) who have common information needs that often cut across several disciplines or encompass only one particular subdivision of a broad discipline. Effective service to such groups is a first approach to the future goal of individual service geared to each user's specific requirements.

We have called particular attention, as have several committees and panels before us (for example, the Weinberg Panel, Ref. 170), to the *ever-growing need to sift, evaluate, compile, and consolidate* the rapidly expanding store of scientific and technical information.

And possibly most crucial, we have suggested mechanisms and policies that we believe will be the most *effective means of coordinating and focusing scientific and technical communication efforts* during this transitional period of burgeoning activity and rapid change.

Fundamental to the SATCOM philosophy is our recognition that a basic element of strength in our country's overall scientific and technical communication effort is the *participation of the members of the scientific and technical community* in its development and administration. As a result of their broad participation, our extraordinarily diverse communication programs and services have maintained a flexible responsiveness to changing and newly emerging needs as well as fulfilling a variety of other functions not entirely relevant to communication but reflecting firmly established traditions and work habits of scientists, engineers, and practitioners or of the organizations with which they are associated. Because so many kinds of information must be communicated, and because there are increasingly wide variations among groups of users in regard to the types of information that they need and the forms and language in which they need it (see Chapter 4, Sections A and B), this flexibility and responsiveness must remain intrinsic to our scientific and technical communication network.

In our concern for maximizing the strengths implicit in our diversity (diverse components, fulfilling an ever-expanding range of functions, and associated with various managing, producing, using, and marketing groups) and for providing continuing responsiveness and progress in meeting new and increasing demands, we have developed *a few broad guiding principles* that have colored nearly all our recommendations and supplied criteria for our decisions on difficult and controversial issues.

The first of these guiding principles is: *The management of all scientific and technical communication activities must be as responsive as possible to the needs, desires, and innovative ideas of the scientific and technical groups that they serve. These activities must be sufficiently flexible to adapt rapidly to changes in user needs and communication techniques.* In this context, we especially emphasize the need for an equitable balance of influence among the managers of information programs, the generators and users of information, and those who market information products. Therefore, there should be ample opportunities for interaction among these groups, both within particular programs and between different programs.

Though we have emphasized diversity in speaking of today's scientific and technical information needs and concerns, the most obvious problem is that of sheer size. The great bulk of material to be handled poses administrative, economic, and intellectual problems, which have been further aggravated by the rapid expansion of our country's research and development effort, the accelerated pace of science and technology, and the ever-growing diversity of needs. While there are obvious advantages to centralizing authority over large areas of information and communication activities, overcentralization can negate the responsiveness that we regard as so vital to the continued effectiveness of scientific and technical communication. Consequently, as a second guiding principle, we believe that: *The administrative entities responsible for scientific and technical information programs must be so organized and coordinated that they represent a logical and efficient division of functions, but authority over them must be sufficiently widely distributed to achieve the responsiveness we deem essential.*

Third, we feel that it would be fatal to ignore the purely intellectual problems posed by the mass of knowledge that is inexorably accumulating; therefore: *The planning of our information activities must involve constant attention to the simplification and consolidation of existing knowledge and its frequent reprocessing to adapt it to the needs of diverse users, especially those primarily engaged in the practical application of scientific and technical information.*

A brief discussion of three vitally important problem areas will further illustrate the SATCOM philosophy. The first such problem area is that of defining *the relative roles of the federal government and private organizations—both not for profit and for profit*—in the communication of scientific and technical information. Private and government organizations have, or should have, the common objective of providing information services that are increasingly responsive to the needs of users of scientific and technical information. However, there are basic differences in the motivation and capabilities inherently identified with not-for-profit, for-profit, and government organizations, and each of these types of organizations has characteristics or attributes that are uniquely its own. The roles of these various kinds of organizations should be mutually reinforcing, with each being assisted in or given the opportunity to fulfill those communication functions to which it is best suited.

The *not-for-profit private organizations* have a vital part to play in the communication of scientific and technical information. Such organizations include the vast array of scientific and technical societies that came into existence principally to serve the information needs of the disciplines that they represent. Because their members typically are among the principal generators and users of scientific and technical information, the societies are uniquely able to collect, assemble, and assure the quality of the information that they distribute through their basic primary and secondary publications programs. And they have a widely recognized and generally accepted responsibility for assuring the continuity and progress of their particular domains of science or technology.

The unique attribute of the *private for-profit organizations* in the fulfillment of their equally vital role in the communication of scientific and technical information is that their survival and growth depend directly upon their ability to recognize, understand, and adequately serve users' needs. This ability has important applications in the service of both scientific and technical societies and the federal government and should be fully utilized. Such organizations traditionally have been particularly effective in providing information for the practioner and in developing specialized, highly user-oriented services, some of which are designed especially to serve the research community.

Every *government agency* must support the scientific and technical information activities that are required in the accomplishment of its mission. In addition, the federal government inevitably must provide substantial support, through certain of its agencies, to scientific and technical information efforts in the public interest. Clearly such support cannot be extended without the exercise of responsible management and control. Minimizing the danger of conflict between such control and a ready response to the needs and views of the scientific and technical communities is a difficult task. We believe that such difficulties can be minimized if the support of a discipline's scientific and technical information services does not become more narrowly concentrated than its support of that discipline's overall research and development effort.

The *economics of information services* constitutes a second major and pervasive problem area. At the present time, different mechanism provide for the revenues and determine the market prices of primary publications and secondary awareness and access services, though both types of services are directly related to our government's massive commitment to science and technology. In the case of primary publications, the practice of allowing the payment of page charges for publication of work generated under research and development contracts has provided a logical distribution of responsibility between generators and users and has afforded financial stability to journals in spite of fluctuations in amount of input and number of subscribers (see Chapter 4, Section E). But at no time has this practice been universally accepted (see the recent study of the Biological Sciences Communication Project of The George Washington University on *Scientific Journal Page Charge Practice*, Ref. 20), and, as budgets tighten, opposition is increasing. The collection of adequate data on costs and experimentation with new publishing procedures and with other, possibly more feasible means of supporting publication are solely needed. And the situation is even more complex in regard to secondary services that provide for bibliographic control, document availability, and abstracting and indexing. Such services have derived federal support under legislatively authorized programs, through direct subsidy, and from indirect charges under government contracts. Therefore, they are geared to widely differing demands and market conditions. As a result, any comparison of efficiency is difficult, and obstacles to seemingly practical cooperative arrangements are numerous.

The costs of scientific and technical communication undoubtedly will increase, both absolutely and as a fraction of the overall cost of research and development, and our recommendations recognize the strong dependence of the scope, nature, and time scale of further developments in scientific and technical communication on economic factors. The economic efficiency of all services, and the viability of unsubsidized ones, would be greatly enhanced by a rational division of functions among different types of organizations, by their recognition and acceptance of such coordination, and by the provision of adequate channels for communication and cooperation among them. In addition, operators of scientific and technical information programs should incorporate into their services on a continuous and systematic basis appropriate feedback mechanisms and methods of performance evaluation and should continuously explore *the possibilities of establishing a closer relationship between costs and the effectiveness of services.* Unless there are palpable indications to the contrary, market rates that establish themselves for services should be used as empirical guides to user needs (though sluggish user responses to new services must be taken into consideration). In many instances, sufficient assured support (from government or private sources) should be provided to permit necessary modifications or innovations to be applied promptly.

A third vitally important area is the impact of new techniques on scientific and technical communication programs and practices. New information-handling technology offers the key to further promising advances, but it also raises difficult problems. We expect continued changes, probably major ones, in the near future in many respects of scientific and technical communication as a result of such new developments as techniques of inexpensive and rapid photoduplication (full scale and microform). In the more distant future, the on-line use of modern electronic computer systems in combination with more effective communication facilities holds great promise. These techniques offer opportunities to make information services more responsive than ever before to the needs of diverse groups of users. To realize this objective, the management of such information programs and services should foster imaginative innovations and provide ample opportunities for the exploration and testing of new procedures. Because of the complexity of the problems to be solved and the need for experimental approaches to many of them, it is difficult to predict the forms that new information services will assume or the times at which they will come into being. In many instances, the development of new services should be gradual, often involving some parallelism with existing ones; the latter should not be allowed to cease operation before the ability of new ones to replace them has been tested adequately.

B. ORGANIZATION OF AND SUBJECT AREAS TREATED IN SATCOM RECOMMENDATIONS

In the following chapter, "The Recommendations Discussed," our 55 recommendations are presented in full, with accompanying discussion to indicate the rationale for and implications of each. The purpose of this section is to sketch briefly the organization and general subject matter of the recommendations. (A guide to the SATCOM recommendations appears in Appendix C and summarizes the specific content of each recommendation for the reader who needs to locate particular ones rapidly.)

Since a chief objective of SATCOM is to build upon and strengthen the present pluralistic and decentralized scientific and technical communication complex by fostering greater cooperation and coordination among its diverse components, our first 11 recommendations in the initial section of Chapter 3 deal with "Planning, Coordination, and Leadership at the National Level." Foremost among these recommendations is one that calls for the creation of a broadly representative and high-prestige *nongovernmental body to stimulate greater coordination* among private interests—both not-for-profit and for-profit—and to serve as a channel for their interaction with governmental policy-making bodies (Recommendation A1). The proposed body would operate within the structure of the National Academies where (a) maximum knowledge and expertise would be available to it; (b) there would be broad representation of the organization, groups, and individuals whose efforts depend on and influence scientific and technical communication; (c) the desired type of interaction with the federal government would be facilitated; and (d) a tradition of diversified and intensive involvement in scientific and technical communication activities exists. The proposed organization would be a continuing one with a full-time professional staff.

Four subsequent recommendations emphasize a philosophy of *shared responsibility* between the federal government and private for-profit and not-for-profit organizations for the effective communication of scientific and technical information. These recommendations (A2–A5) define the relative roles of each of these types of organizations and indicate specific areas of responsibility.

Looking beyond national boundaries, which signify little in scientific and technical communication, we next address a series of recommendations (A6–A9) to the principal types of *international communication activities*: (a) direct arrangements between societies or government-agency programs for sharing the work and products of information services; (b) cooperative international research projects, such as the International Geophysical Year and [illegible] International Biological Program; and (c) efforts of international organiza[illegible] to stimulate or develop cooperative arrangements among nations that will facilitate the flow of scientific and technical information.

In the final two of the initial group of recommendations, we deal with two complex problem areas, *copyright legislation* and the *evolution of standards* affecting scientific and technical communication. Since, in both instances, we feel that no rapid and easy solutions can be achieved, we suggest careful study and continuing attention to the development of appropriate and feasible arrangements (Recommendations A10 and A11).

In a second group of 15 recommendations entitled "Consolidation and Repackaging—Services for the User," we look at the ever more diversified and specialized demands for scientific and technical information and the ways in which such demands can and must be met. First, *review and consolidation* always have been among the best means of increasing the effective use of information and, with the accelerating growth of the existing body of information and data, must assume an even more prominent role. Therefore, four recommendations (B1–B4) urge recognition and acceptance of responsibilities for the consolidation of the information generated in research and development, measures to increase the allocation of resources—both economic and intellectual—to this function, and steps to enhance access to such consolidations.

Recommendations B5 through B9 deal with the provision of specialized services that will *facilitate the practical application of information*, especially in engineering, agriculture, and medicine. Hand-tailored services for groups of at least a thousand who share common information needs can and must be provided. Such groups must be identified and their needs clearly defined so that they can be served more effectively. In this area, the private for-profit organizations have been especially active, and their experience and capabilities should be utilized to the fullest. Such specialized services typically involve the repackaging of the products of basic abstracting and indexing services; therefore, funding policies that will foster the ready availability of such information products for repackaging are urgently required. We regard the stimulation and expansion of repackaging activities as the most important thrust in making scientific and technical information effective for those who use it, and suggestions that will further this effort appear in Recommendations B10 through B12.

Even as access to reviews presents a problem, so too does access to the basic abstracting and indexing services appropriate to the particular needs of diverse user groups; Recommendation B13 addresses this problem. The largely unrealized potential of the information analysis centers (IACs) in the provision of specialized services is the subject of Recommendation B14, and two final recommendations treat management problems which, though encountered in all forms and levels of scientific and technical communication, are especially prominent in providing highly user-oriented services. The development of adequate and continuing feedback mechanisms to assure the relevance of services and increased recognition of the need for substantial marketing and educational efforts to overcome the so-called "in a rut" and "line of least resistance" behavior patterns of used faced with new and improved services are the concerns of the two concluding recommendations in this section (B15 and B16).

The third group of 16 recommendations deals with "The Classical Services" of basic abstracting and indexing, library functions, formal and semiformal publications, and meetings. In line with the principles advocated in the inital section with regard to the government and private sector roles in the communication of scientific and technical information, we explicitly advocate management of *discipline-wide basic abstracting and indexing services* by appropriate scientific and technical societies and the management of other broad bibliographc services (*e.g.*, title listings, and citation indexes) by commercial organizations, national libraries, *or* societies, with support of these activities, when necessary, by the government agencies to whose operations they are relevant (Recommendation C1). Three subsequent recommendations (C2–C4) suggest measures that will enhance the effectiveness of basic abstracting and indexing services.

The *crucial role of libraries* as nodes in a vast switching network is an area of particular concern and is the focus of the recent report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries (see Chapter 3, Section C, and Ref. 121). We believe that pouring more and more money indiscriminately into libraries will not solve their complex problems. Recommendation C5 advocates a funding policy aimed at introducing: (a) a more realistic reflection of library costs into the conduct of scientific and technological work; (b) a closer relationship between costs and services; and (*c*) more options of extra service for an extra price. A subsequent recommendation (C6) focuses on education—both education of users in relation to the existing array of library services and training programs that place greater emphasis on the operational analysis of library services. Such measures would help libraries to perform more efficiently and effectively.

Seven recommendations (C7–C13) are directed to the organizations and institutions that exercise *stewardship and control over primary scientific and technical publications*. The increasing volume and diversity of primary communications raise special problems, particularly in the area of pricing and funding. Difficulties underlying much of the existing controversy about the appropriate placement of financial responsibility for the publication of new findings result from (a) the dependence of the way of funding scientific and technical communication on the ways our nation funds education and research; and (b) the economics of supply and demand relating to scientific and technical communication, which depart so far from the classical pattern that allowing the fate of publications to rest entirely on the test of the marketplace frequently is not feasible. Systematic study and analysis of the economics of formal publications are required for the development of flexible and feasible funding and pricing policies (Recommendation C7). Further, in this transitional stage when new and more effective funding mechanisms have yet to emerge, it is essential that sponsors of research and development continue to recognize their responsibilities for the dissemination of results by observing the established page-charge policy. This policy offers a logical division of responsibility between producer and consumer and has helped to stabilize the economic position of journals in the face of fluctuations in input and subscriptions (Recommendation C8). Succeeding recommendations in this group (C9–C13) suggest measures to stimulate experimentation with new media and techniques of formal publication, for example, with systems for the selective dissemination of information, and efforts to enhance the effectiveness of formal media.

Two recommendations pertaining to *semiformal communication* center on (a) ensuring, in so far as is practicable, adequate bibliographic control, so that such material can be identified and located; (b) affording general accessibility through storage in depositories; and (*c*) limiting distribution to the extent necessary to protect formal, refereed publications. Measures to facilitate the use of technical reports with substantive content also are suggested (Recommendations C14 and C15).

In the last recommendation of this group, we recognize the effectiveness of meetings in providing current information and facilitating productive informal interaction, and urge a more innovative and forward-looking approach to the *planning and conduct of meetings* by sponsoring groups (Recommendation C16).

The fourth section deals with the major role of "Personal Informal Communication" in the conduct of research and the application of scientific and technical knowledge and describes some of the factors that foster widespread dependence upon this type of information exchange. Pending the conduct of studies that will clarify and provide more comprehensive data on the ways in which informal channels operate, we offer in this area only two recommendations (D1 and D2) which are directed toward facilitating the occurrence of informal interaction in certain contexts.

Throughout the preceding groups of recommendations the need for additional data and for experiments with new approaches and technologies appears and reappears. In a final section on "Studies, Research, and Experiments," ten recommendations indicate the *type of studies and experiments most urgently needed* and guidelines for their conduct. High priority is accorded the initiation of comprehensive analyses of and experiments on the functioning of different parts of the network of scientific and technical communication as well as of its overall operation (Recommendation E1). Efforts to develop measures of the value of information services and means of overcoming user apathy or resistance in the face of new options and services should receive major emphasis in such studies (Recommendation E2). Additionally, comparisons of various means of storage and transmission, and careful consideration of their implications for information-handling practices, deserve special attention (Recommendation E3).

The *application of advanced technologies* to the scientific and technical communication process presents multifaceted and challenging problems. Recommendations E4 through E9 suggest significant and much needed types of experiments involving (a) machine-aided indexing, (b) evolutionary indexing of small, widely used, single-interest-area files, (c) development and evaluation of languages for describing the formats of files and of other types of digital communication systems, and (d) development of standard structures for each widely used bibliographic documentary information element. The participation of highly competent scientists, engineers, and practitioners in such experiments is of vital importance; consequently, the responsibility of the scientific and technical societies for encouraging this participation receives special emphasis (Recommendation E7).

Large-scale experiments that involve large populations and the use of advanced technologies are necessary for the fulfillment of increasingly diverse needs; such experiments constitute exploratory development as well as research. As a result, they require special provisions for planning and funding—provisions that assure continuity by assigning responsibility for the development of a unified program of critical experiments to a single group and adequately supporting this group (Recommendation E10).

C. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Implicit in SATCOM's philosophy, and the recommendations that follow from it, is recognition of the need for continuing change in the ways of doing the work of science and technology. By calling upon scientists, engineers, and practitioners to take a greater personal role in the development and use of their communication systems; by summoning administrators of information systems, be they university officials, scientific and technical society officers, corporation presidents, or government officials, to recognize the pervasive role of economics in scientific and technical communication and to adapt or modify their policies and practices accordingly; and by presenting to policy planners new options in organization and methodology we are, in effect, seeking appropriate changes in their values and behavior, and, ultimately, in the methodologies of science and technology.

Corollary to this effort is the role of education. If such changes as we are recommending are necessary to strengthen science and technology—and we believe they are—then efforts must be made at all levels to effect such changes. We have refrained—wisely, we believe, given the complicated nature of our own topic—from making recommendations on the future course of scientific and technological education. We hope, however, that those of our colleagues who are actively engaged in educating the next generation of scientists, engineers, and practitioners will find it this report stimuli for new approaches and ideas.

Library Functions

The role of libraries, particularly research libraries and special libraries, is central in the process of communicating scientific and technical information. The great research libraries store and make accessible primary scientific and technical journals as well as secondary publications (abstracts and indexes that constitute the means of finding articles according to author, title, or subject), and even guides to these secondary services. They maintain bibliographic control, custody, and a delivery system for enormous collections of monographs and journals and provide a rich variety of reference books and services. They act in many respects as nodes in a switching network that make available information from other sources (see Chapter 6, Section E). Through many thousands of special libraries in various types of corporations and institutions, a multiplicity of highly specialized mission-oriented services are provided. Though the role that libraries play is crucial, the tradition of informal person-to-person communication as a way of keeping up with what is taking place in a scientific specialty is strong, and very often the services of libraries are bypassed through unwillingness to put up with slower and more cumbersome procedures or through ignorance of their availability.

As the backlog of knowledge accumulates, and scientific communication therefore becomes more and more complex, it is clear that many traditional practices will become increasingly unresponsive. Two main lines of attack on the problem are clearly indicated: First, library services should be improved, and second, scientists should become more familiar with the various types of information services that *are* provided.

The push-button library of the future—a vast store of machine-recorded data interrogated in a rapidly responsive on-line interactive system and supported by a great communication network—will eventually come about in some form or, in fact, in a variety of forms. It is not our purpose to prognosticate the detailed nature or the rate of development of such systems but to attempt to point out at least some of the crucial changes of an institutional, organizational, and philosophic nature that must be brought about in order to create the kind of environment within which technological innovation and the evolutionary improvement of libraries can flourish.

If the application of modern technology seems to lag in libraries as compared with other areas, it is because the scope of the problem is immense, and more particularly, because our society and its institutions are not effectively organized for a direct attack on the broad systems-planning problems that lie at the heart of the matter. The large research libraries, in particular, face serious problems which cut across institutional boundaries. None of them can hope to be fully self-sufficient even for the relatively limited community of scientists and scholars whom it serves; instead, each must rely heavily on national bibliographic services and on the cooperative use of information resources with other libraries. The same is true, but even more strongly of course, for the smaller college and research libraries.

Simply to say that more money must be poured indiscriminately into libraries is not enough, for without the proper guidelines and a reasonable degree of overall planning on a nationwide basis, the need for funds could become a bottomless pit. A deep reappraisal of the method of funding library services should be made. The possibilities of a closer tie between obtaining library services and paying for them should be carefully explored. Even assuming some base level of "free" library service, if users had the option of extra service for an extra price, the test of the marketplace might provide valuable guidance on the optimal allocation of library resources toward the most valuable services. Very often, however, user response to new, even good, services is characteristically slow; therefore, a greater marketing effort must be mounted. Probably scientists and scholars are slow to acquaint themselves with existing library and information services simply because society tends to reward originality rather than thorough literature searching. Yet, it is hard to believe that this state of affairs will continue when it becomes widely apparent that much rediscovery of what is already known is taking place. Though the process may be slow and cumbersome, it seems clear that a readjustment of the habits of the scientific community is necessary. A different balance must be struck between the allocation of time for original research and the time spent searching, assimilating, reviewing, and consolidating the literature.

In view of this obligation of the scientific community, it is imperative that library services be made much more responsive. There are few limits to what can be done, given adequate resources. However, the burgeoning federal support of the scientific and technical research of the last two decades has not been matched with sufficient support of the library and information services that are necessary to ensure effective communication of the results of scientific research.

The following recommendations are addressed to these shortcomings, and offer hope of creating an environment in which there is large scope for private for-profit and not-for-profit initiative, innovation, and the application of new technology.

Recommendation C5: More support should be provided for library services in colleges, universities, and other institutions with substantial educational and research programs in science and engineering. This should be done principally in two ways:

1. Through direct grants by the National Science Foundation, and other granting agencies where appropriate, for the strengthening of research-library services, with emphasis on start-up costs for innovative services.

2. Through provision in the various research grants to these institutions, whatever the granting agency, of adequate funds specifically for library and information services, preferably provided in such a way that researchers can exercise discretion in the use of these funds for services that they find most valuable.

The intent of this recommendation is to bring about a more realistic reflection of library costs in the conduct of scientific and technical research, a closer relationship between costs and services, and more options for the user of "extra service at a price." We emphasize the term library *services*, since such services may and usually should cut across institutional lines and involve the concept of networks and the cooperative use of library resources. It is presumptive that the institutions most deserving of support are those that most adequately plan and analyze library operations in terms of cost, effectiveness, and optimum allocation of resources with other institutions. However, in small colleges and universities, even the conventional resources of current journals and abstracting and indexing services often are seriously deficient, and we cannot uncritically assume that improvement is to be brought about *only* by the sharing of resources.

The program suggested in the first part of the Recommendation C5 might be structured and administered in a manner similar to the NSF's program in computer facilities for universities and, in many instances, should be coordinated with the latter.

Recommendation C6: The U.S. Office of Education should support a broad program in library education (in addition to or as part of its present program under Title II B of the Higher Education Act), with special attention to the following objectives:

1. The training of more students in systems analysis, systems planning, and operational analysis of libraries and library services.

2. The training of all students as well as faculty (throughout their college careers if feasible) in the use of the increasingly complex array of existing library and information services.

Marketing of library services should begin with better efforts to make the use of such services an integral part of the education process. Support of this recommended program may imply in many cases the support of library services essentially as educational laboratories for the smaller colleges and universities, which may not have research programs extensive enough to justify library support under Recommendation C5.

The mechanism of formula grants by geographic districts, based on the number of graduates from eligible undergraduate institutions, may prove appropriate here. Arrangements should include the use of appropriate reimbursement for such services.

Comments on the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries

The National Advisory Commission on Libraries was directed (a) to study and appraise the role of libraries "as resources for scholarly pursuits, as centers for the dissemination of knowledge, and as components of the evolving national information systems" (Ref. 121); (b) to appraise institutional policies and practices affecting the use of libraries; (c) to appraise library funding; and (d) to develop recommendations for action. The recent report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries (Ref. 121) makes a series of five recommendations, the basic import of which is compatible with the recommendations of SATCOM. While it is not our purpose to offer either critique or overall endorsement of their report, the following quotations from it are so much in harmony with our thinking that we invite special attention to these points. First:

"The Commission believes that libraries are both essential and major elements in providing resources for scholarship in almost all fields of knowledge, in serving as centers for the dissemination of knowledge, and in serving as components in the evolving national information systems. The library role in these matters is in fact so critical that the Commission believes that libraries serving these purposes must be significantly strengthened. This increased strength will require a variety of different approaches and techniques: Federal support, long-range planning, and better coordination are all urgent requirements."

In their common recognition of the importance of what SATCOM has called need groups, it is clear that both SATCOM and the National Advisory Commission have the common objective of maximizing and taking advantage of the strength of diversity in the pluralistic system of library and information services presently existing in the nation:

"No monolithic Federal or other centralized administrative control seems either feasible or desirable. There will have to be many different kinds of information systems and working relationships among a variety of institutions if we are to provide effective access to relevant information for our society. New systems, roles, and relationships are likely to emerge at very different rates of speed in response to widely varying user needs."

Further, to ensure responsiveness of services and to fulfill user needs effectively:

"It follows . . . that naturally evolving systems that clearly serve the needs of users should be given support in their own right at this time. No one can perceive the final nature of communications and information-exchange networks, nor the quality of a national information system—with a single exception. The exception is that such a system will finally be made up of a large number of highly specialized individual components, each one of which should be designed to serve the needs of a defined user group."

Finally, the need for increased library support to reflect the increasing demands of federally sponsored research also is brought out clearly.

"The increase in research conducted by universities and sponsored by Federal and State agencies, corporations, and foundations, has made demands upon university libraries that have not been satisfied by either the growth of library collections or staffs. All agencies of government, foundations, industries, and other organizations that subsidize research by contracts, grants-in-aid, fellowships, and other means should be made aware of the greatly augmented burden on the library that their grants and subventions commonly entail. This should be taken into account in the planning of grants and programs. Continuity of such funding is critically important."

Among the five recommendations resulting from the National Advisory Commission's extensive studies, analyses, and deliberations is one that calls for the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, to be established by the Congress and located within the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such a Commission would serve as a continuing federal planning agency and as a means of developing and implementing new policies and library services to meet the nation's needs. This Commission would advise the federal government and other institutions on library and information needs, would conduct studies, and recommend legislation to strengthen the nation's library and information services.

We do not feel that the Commission proposed by the National Advisory Commission conflicts with our Recommendation A1, which advocates the creation of a Joint Commission on Scientific and Technical Communication responsible to the Councils of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering. Rather, we believe that these two proposed bodies could complement and supplement one another's efforts to cope with a vast and multifaceted array of problems. The important role that the libraries of the future will play as components in national information systems and networks suggests that, if the proposed National Commission on Libraries and Information Science comes into being, it could provide valuable input to the SATCOM-proposed Joint Commission on Scientific and Technical Communication, which, in turn, frequently could aid and assist the efforts of the former. We believe that the philosophies of SATCOM and the National Advisory Commission are much the same; however, we believe that those aspects of the information problem that transcend the library problem can be best handled by the mechanisms we propose, and that there is ample need and scope for the efforts or both the proposed Commissions.

ENCLOSURE C

Chapter 10

A JOINT COMMISSION ON SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COMMUNICATION

As a result of the need for improved planning, coordination, and leadership at the national level, *we recommend the establishment of a Joint Commission on Scientific and Technical Communication, responsible to the Councils of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering (see Recommendation A1 in Chapter 3, Section A).*

A. MISSION AND ILLUSTRATIVE PROBLEM AREAS

The Commission is to be conversant with activities in scientific and technical communication and to provide guidance useful to public and private organizations in the development of more effective scientific and technical communication. It also should be responsible for leading the private sector in the coordination of its interests and programs and in the development of broad and farsighted plans. Therefore, its mission should entail:

1. Serving the scientific and technical community by fostering coordination and consolidation of its interests in the handling of scientific and technical information.
2. Serving the government by providing representatively comprehensive and authoritative information and advice on the activities, needs, and ideas of the scientific and technical community in this field.

To fulfill this mission, the Commission should identify needs and requirements and actively stimulate efforts to explore appropriate arrangements for cooperation and coordination. It must review and contribute to the broad planning of scientific and technical information activities and would expect to assist the federal government in building and adapting a framework of policy for the effective operation of scientific and technical communication. It also would provide a forum for the timely and broad-gauged review of currently acute issues.

In recent years, increasingly effective organizational mechanisms have fulfilled these functions in relation to the scientific and technical information-handling efforts of federal agencies. However, no effective mechanism exists at the present time for facilitating interaction between the government structure and the activities of private organizations—both for profit and not for profit—in this field. The emergence of a coordinating institution of broad scope and representation in the private sector is necessary for the development of such interaction. To fulfill this role will be one of the primary objectives of the proposed Commission.

The extreme complexity of the entire scientific and technical communication system is such as to expose it today, and with increasing severity tomorrow, to the unforeseen disruptions and crises so characteristic of large aggregates of activities, the interdependence of which is not fully understood and which are not well-coordinated. Some crises already are upon us (e.g., the page-charge issue); others lie ahead. They will require continuing efforts on the part of the Commission.

For the near future, we believe that stimulating and expanding the reprocessing and consolidation of scientific and technical information is the most important thrust in making such information effective for those who use it. The need for sifting, evaluating, and consolidating the rapidly accumulating store of information and data in the various scientific and technical disciplines is urgent. If more detailed analyses bear out our broad estimate that the current effort invested in reviews, state-of-the-art summaries, and critical data compilations is only a small fraction of the requirement, then this problem certainly merits the Commission's immediate efforts. Consequently, we have directed a number of recommendations toward this end (see Chapter 3, Section B), three of which indicate specific responsibilities for the proposed Commission: (a) The Commission should give special attention to assisting the growth of need-group information services; (b) the Commission should explore ways for systematically extending the use of the capabilities afforded by major information analysis centers in the transfer of technological information; and (c) the Commission should consider the steps that might be taken to afford easier and more effective access to particular reviews appropriate to a user's specific need. In addition, the Commission should foster awareness of the need to support consolidation efforts and to educate potential users.

Another problem that we consider of comparable importance is the development of a substantially more coherent pattern of cooperation among the many and diverse secondary information services. Efforts to develop such a coordinated pattern involve not only subtle technical problems, especially in regard to standards and convertibility, but require the establishment of realistic pricing and funding policies for such services.

The problem of pricing and funding is a pressing and pervasive one that will require careful study and continuing effort on the part of the Commission. A basic tenet of the Weinberg Report (Ref. 170) is that research is not complete until the results are made available. This availability includes not only publication but later steps in the inofrmation-transfer chain that provide for alerting and access and for consolidation and review, all of which are essential to the effective utilization of the knowledge generated by research and development. With regard to the initial publication of results, the page-charge policy was one attempt at practical implementation of such a principle, and issuance of a recommendation by the Federal Council for Science and Technology (FCST) in 1961, allowing the assessment of some part of the cost of publication (through page charges) against the original research funding, resulted in widespread acceptance of this responsibility among government agencies. Many scientific and technical societies, however, were slow to accept this policy, and page charges were never universally levied. Recently, under present budget constraints, many institutions are discontinuing the voluntary honoring of page charges and, as a result, some journals face the threat of bankruptcy. Yet this crisis represents only one aspect of the problem. In contrast to primary publication, there has never been an effective mechanism through which resources available for the operation of secondary information services were coupled directly to overall expenditures on science and technology. And, in spite of the strong emphasis in the Weinberg Report, review and consolidation efforts still are far from adequately supported. There is crucial and immediate need (a) to foster recognition of the responsibilities of producers and sponsors of research and development work for the processing of the information so generated, and (b) to develop new and feasible mechanisms of implementation.

Another area for Commission attention pertains to the way in which the opportunities for innovation afforded by advanced technology might be explored. The Commission should urge the priority of large-scale experiments and the participation of qualified scientists, engineers, and practitioners in these efforts. Further, it should foster the application of the results of such experiments in contexts other than the particular ones in which they are obtained.

A final illustration of problem areas that require immediate Commission attention and study is one pertaining to limitations on the export of unclassified information. Restrictions on the publication of much graduate student research generated under federal contracts have resulted from varying interpretations of the Export Control Act and the Munitions Control Act, and such restrictions are increasing. Should this trend persist, it could greatly hamper the communication of the results of a substantial portion of the newest research and development work.

B. OPERATION AND STRUCTURE

Members of the Commission would be appointed by the Presidents of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering. The Academies would employ and house the staff of the Commission, and the Commission would be responsible to their Councils, though in the everyday conduct of its work, it would deal with the Presidents of the two Academies and their staffs.

The Commission would communicate through the Presidents of the National Academies to: (a) the membership and leaders of the scientific and technical community; (b) scientific, technical, and educational societies and institutions; (c) for-profit organizations; (d) the relevant foci for scientific and technical communication activities in the federal government, especially the Office of Science and Technology, the FCST's Committee on Scientific and Technical Information, and the NSF's Office of Science Information Service; and (e) other supporters of science, technology, and information services.

Effective liaison must be maintained, especially with federal agencies, and special efforts will be necessary to ensure that current concerns receive thorough airing from the respective viewpoints of the government's requirements and the capabilities of private organizations—viewpoints that hopefully will become less and less often at odds with one another.

Commission membership should include as broad a representation as feasible of the major scientific and technical communities and the principal kinds of organizations engaged in related information-handling activities, as well as representatives of the Councils of the National Academies and liaison members from the principal government activities. Such coverage could be provided by a membership of about 20. Additionally, the Commission should continue to draw upon the advice and assistance of the nearly 200 Consulting Correspondents whom SATCOM has assembled (see Appendixes A and B).

Initially, the Commission would need to establish a number of *ad hoc* committees and task groups to study major problem areas. As areas requiring long-term, continuing attention were identified, suitable standing committees, with responsibility for the development of pertinent programs of activity, could be created.

The Commission could be especially helpful in suggesting directions and setting priorities for new efforts in research and exploratory innovation. To do so, it would need to develop a basic conceptual framework for the evolving pattern of scientific and technical communication from which to derive guidelines for future efforts and criteria for appraising current ones. In addition, through its activities, committee structure, and Consulting Correspondents, it could provide a national forum for the critical review and appraisal of professional work in the field of scientific and technical communication. Finally, the influence of such a Commission could help to ensure in the scientific and technical community a heightened sense of participation in proposing, shaping, and implementing pertinent policies and should decreas the possibility of sterile endeavors.

C. DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATIVES

Four considerations prompted us to suggest the two Academies as the optimum location for the proposed Commission.

1. A principal and continuing concern will be that of ensuring that the scientific and technical communication system is increasingly responsive to the contemporary pattern and requirements of science and technology; therefore, the Commission should be located where a maximum of knowledge and expertise in regard to the latter is readily avalable to it.
2. The National Academies, together with the National Research Council, come as close as any existing organization to embracing the representative organizations, groups, and individuals whose efforts depend on or influence the shape of scientific and technical communication.
3. The kind of interaction with the federal government envisioned for the recommended Commission is in complete accord with the legislation under which the Academies are chartered and which led to their establishment.
4. The present broad, diverse, and long-term involvement of the Academies, and of the numerous divisions of the National Research Council, in scientific and technical communication activities (see Section D of this chapter for examples of Academy information activities) suggests that they would be a most appropriate location for the proposed Commission.

As one alternative, we considered the creation of an independent National Advisory Commission on Scientific and Technical Communication, the membership of which would bring together both high-level representatives of the federal government and outstanding citizens. Either appointed under the aegis of the White House, or under arrangements jointly responsive to the Legislative and Executive Branches of the government, such a Commission could be related to the President's Science Advisory Committee through assignment of the staffing function to the Office of Science and Technology. It seems unlikely, however, that any newly created, independent commission could equal the prestige and authority of the Academies in the scientific and technical communities to which its efforts would be principally addressed. Nor would a newly created independent agency have the broad representation and heavy involvement in scientific and technical information activities that characterizes the two Academies and the National Research Council. The latter is specifically charged with: ". . . developing effective means of utilizing the scientific and technical resources of the country . . ., promoting cooperation in research . . . in order to secure concentration of effort, minimize duplication, and stimulate progress . . ., and to gather and collate scientific and technical information, at home and abroad, in cooperation with governmental and other agencies." (See Ref. 119, NAS–NAE–NRC *Organization and Members 1967–1968*, page 7.) To fulfill these objectives the Academies and the Council channel participation in international research programs; cooperate in the planning of national and international meetings, conferences, and symposia; sponsor a large number of scientific and technical communication programs and projects; and support a broad publications program.

Another alternative is the establishment of an agency within the federal government with broad executive authority, and perhaps even an extensive budget, to which responsibility for the supervision and regulation of the scientific and technical information system would be assigned, a concept which has been proposed and extensively discussed under the designation of a "capping agency." (See Carter *et al.*, Ref. 37.) We do not consider it advisable at this time to create a new federal agency or to empower an existing one with the responsibility to supervise and regulate the national aggregate of scientific and technical communication activities. It is doubtful that such a course would produce gains in either effectiveness or economy commensurate with the losses contingent upon reduced monitoring and control of input to its communication systems by the scientific and technical community. Additionally, much of the initiative and ingenuity contributed by private organizations to the solution of information problems might be stifled if all major ventures in response to emerging needs and opportunities had to pass through the filter of a single government agency. It was just such concern with assuring the involvement of and interaction with the scientific and technical community which, on OST–NSF initiative, led to the creation of SATCOM itself and its location in the NAS–NAE structure. (See *Activities of the Federal Council for Science and Technology, Report for 1965 and 1966*, Ref. 62.)

D. ROLE OF THE COMMISSION IN THE TWO ACADEMIES

A multiplicity of information-exchange activities offering numerous opportunities for mutual assistance have already been undertaken by the Academies. Their varied and extensive responsibilities in this area provide a further reason for the proposed location of the Commission. Each of the Divisions of the National Research Council is deeply involved in the dissemination of scientific and technical information in its field, through formal reports and as part of the informal communication network. Additionally, almost all of them conduct one or more activities specifically aimed at improvements in scientific and technical communication. The Division of Biology and Agriculture, for example, is engaged in the preparation of a roster of agricultural specialists with foreign-area experience and in staffing a Council on Biological Science Information. The latter has responsibility for recommending steps toward a more coherent information-transfer network among its disciplines. The Division of Behavioral Sciences sponsors a Committee on Information in the Behavioral Sciences, which recently reported on information needs in this area and the technology for satisfying them. This Committee emphasized that coordinating mechanisms are essential in the development and maintenance of a decentralized national information capability and also recommended the establishment of a coordinating mechanism similar to SATCOM within the Academies, with broad disciplinary representation from the behavioral sciences and the responsibility for fostering cooperation and coordination in this area (see *Communication Systems and Resources in the Behavioral Sciences*, Ref. 42). Since 1947, there has been a committee in the Division of Chemistry and Chemical Technology, currently known as the Committee on Chemical Information. This Committee deals with technical problems in the storage, retrieval, and use of chemical information and has conducted studies on chemical codes, chemical notations systems, and nonconventional methods of handling chemical structures employed in the United States and foreign countries; on the rationale for their use; and on their effectiveness. The Highway Research Board of the Division of Engineering operates an automated information service that covers not only the technical report literature in this field but maintains a file of short reports on work in progress, thereby fulfilling the practitioner's need for information on "who is doing what and where." These various activities provide but a few examples of the nature and scope of the Academies' involvement in scientific and technical communication. See Ref. 135, *Scientific Information Activities of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council*, for further details.)

Additionally, the Office of the Foreign Secretary, through its responsibility for organizing the bodies that coordinate U.S. participation in international programs of scientific cooperation, has developed a substantial stake in the information activities pertaining to such programs. Such activities include the publication of special media for dissemination, the assembly of all documents generated by such programs, and the supervision of data-center operation and coordination.

Within this steadily growing web of diverse information activities, the proposed Commission can be especially effective. It could assist in defining the nature and scope of new communication activities that would be appropriate for Academy sponsorship as well as developing a coherent pattern of Academy participation in the field of scientific and technical communication. In this context, it should be alert to opportunities for new projects in scientific and technical communication and recommend appropriate points of attachment where special interests and capabilities exist.

WHEELER BASIN REGIONAL LIBRARY,
Decatur, Ala., March 28, 1969.

Mr. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: I should like to thank you for your letter advising me of the Bill introduced by you on March 12, 1969, to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

It is my belief that such a Commission would be of immeasurable benefit in the advancement of Libraries throughout the U.S. This Commission, if composed of people at the "grass root" level who know personally the needs, would be in a better position to make the wisest utilization of all the nation's library and information resources. It is my sincere hope that President Nixon make such appointments.

Education has received wider recognition and support, and I realize this importance; however, education is attained through books and if there are not supportive libraries, the learning process suffers.

The training of qualified librarians is an essential element to the depth and scope of a realistic, futuristic plan of elevating education at all levels. In reality, the Library is the one continuing source of education in a community from the pre-school child to the senior citizen.

We are grateful for your assistance in our library development and wish to take this opportunity to thank you.

Sincerely yours,

NANCY R. AGNEW, *Director.*

ALABAMA PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE,
Montgomery, Ala., March 20, 1969.

Mr. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: Thank you very much for your letter of March 12th with the enclosure of the proposed bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

It is my opinion that the enactment of this bill will serve an excellent purpose as outlined in it's provisions. I have felt the need of such legislation for some time. I feel that the professionals as well as those of us who have been associated with them as Trustees at various levels must feel as I do.

I have no particular suggestions about the wording of the proposed bill as it is along the lines of my own thinking. I would like to inquire, however, as to the intent of the amount proposed for the first fiscal year. My copy of the bill seems to have a typographical error.

Libraries and their potential service to all the people are of continued interest to me. I have served on the executive board of the Alabama Public Library Service since 1960 and as chairman of that board since 1964. It has also been my privilege to have served as Chairman of the Trustee's section of the Southeastern Library Association for two years. I have attended virtually all of the national meetings of the American Library Association since 1960 and most of it's mid-winter meetings since that date; the latter because of membership on a national committee of the trustee's division. I am, presently, a member of the Trustee's National Legislative Liaison committee and co-ordinator for the Southeastern States. These opportunities have given me an insight as to the needs as outlined in your proposed bill.

I plan to send copies of this letter to members of the Alabama delegation in the house and senate, many of whom are personal friends, and request their support of this legislation.

Thank you, again, for your courtesy.

Most cordially,

JEROME LEVY, *Chairman.*

MONTGOMERY, ALA., *March 20, 1969.*

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: I have your letter of 12 March with the copy of the bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. I commend you for sponsoring this project which I believe will help to advance library service to all citizens.

I'm sure librarians and allied professionals will strongly support your efforts and hereby pledge my own support.

Sincerely,

ROBERT SEVERANCE,
Council Member, American Library Association.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA,
University, Ala., March 17, 1969.

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have just received your letter of March 12, advising me that you and other members of the House of Representatives have introduced a bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

I am responding to your letter for two reasons: (1) to thank you and congratulate you on the action you have taken and, (2) because of my earlier service with a subcommittee on the President's National Advisory Commission on Libraries, to call your attention to a man whose past record and service entitle him to serious consideration for the first Chairmanship of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, once your bill has been enacted into law.

That man is former Alabama Congressman Carl Elliott who was a member of the President's National Advisory Commission on Libraries and, as such, Chairman of the Commission's Committee on Public Hearings.

I am sure you are familiar with Mr. Elliott's great and abiding interest in education, including libraries. Unless I am mistaken, he held the position you now hold as Chairman of the House Select Subcommittee on Education. During his sixteen years in Congress he earned the respect of all people interested in the welfare and progress of education in the Nation—no better example of his sincere devotion could be cited than the fact that he and Senator Lister Hill were cosponsors of the first National Defense Education Act, more than a decade ago.

As Chairman of the Committee on Public Hearings of the President's National Advisory Commission on Libraries, Mr. Elliott conducted hearings in many sections of the Nation, including one in Anchorage, Alaska. His contribution to the Commission was tremendous. Indeed, in the absence of Chairman Douglas Knight (who was ill during a large part of the time) Mr. Elliott actually did more than any other person to solidify the Commission and press the work forward to completion. The final report of the Commission reflects many of Mr. Elliott's accomplishments.

As for myself, I served as Consultant to the Committee on Hearings of the President's Commission. And, as the University of Alabama's representative to the Association of Research Libraries, I read a paper on the Commission's work (copy attached) at its convention in Kansas City last June 22.

On behalf of myself and thousands of librarians in the United States I congratulate you for introducing the bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science and ask that, in your deliberations, you and your colleagues acknowledge the invaluable service Mr. Elliott has rendered American libraries.

In my judgment no man in the Nation is better qualified for the Chairmanship of the National Commission (once your bill is enacted into law) and I respectfully urge you to use your influence toward that end.

Sincerely yours,

W. Stanley Hoole,
University Librarian.

Association of Research Libraries

MINUTES OF THE [illegible] MEETING, ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., JUNE 21, 1969, ANDREW J. EATON, PRESIDING

Mr. Hoole. My experience on this panel is based primarily on the fact that I served as consultant to the Subcommittee on Public Hearings of the President's National Advisory Commission on Libraries from August, 1967, to February, 1968.

As you know, this Commission was composed of twenty distinguished citizens, including Douglas M. Knight, President of Duke University, as Chairman, and Verner W. Clapp, Herman H. Fussler, and Emerson Greenaway from the library world. Melville J. Ruggles, now program officer of the Council on Library Resources, was the first executive director of the Commission.

President Johnson directed the Commission, "... to appraise the role and adequacy of our libraries, now and in the future, as sources for scholarly research, as centers for the distribution of knowledge, and as links in our nation's rapidly evolving communications networks." The President also asked the Commission, "... to evaluate policies, programs, and practices of public agencies and private organizations ... and to recommend actions which might be taken by public and private groups to ensure an effective, efficient library system for the nation."

While the Washington office contracted for studies on numerous phases of librarianship in America (such as school libraries in the United States, science library information services, library statistics, public library trends, the economics of librarianship, etc.), the Subcommittee on Public Hearings, chaired by Mrs. Bessie B. Moore of Arkansas and former Congressman Carl Elliott, co-author of the National Defense Education Act and a long-time friend of American librarians, conducted a series of hearings which began in St. Louis, Missouri, on April 13 and ended in Tucson, Arizona on October 27. Between these dates hearings were held in Tampa, Florida; Great Falls, Montana; Portland, Oregon; Anchorage and Nome, Alaska; Bismarck, North Dakota; Lubbock, Texas; Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania; Baton Rouge, Louisiana; and Pikeville, Kentucky.

All together in these eleven public hearings, 310 respondents, representing every walk of life, accounted for 2,000 transcript pages of testimony, or one-half million words. Of these 310 witnesses, forty-six (15 per cent) represented seventy-eight institutions of higher learning, including universities, senior colleges, and junior or community colleges.

Needless to say, no facet of the library profession went unnoticed. A content analysis of the hearings reveals that twenty-nine different topics were frequently and widely discussed: five under "Objectives for Overcoming Current Inadequacies"; five under "Recommendations for Achieving Objectives"; seven under the broad heading of "Problems"; and twelve under "Means of Attacking Problems."

As far as university libraries are particularly concerned, the remarks of the forty-six respondents generally followed a monotonous and often repetitious pattern, centered about these major points:

1. A good library is the heart of a good university;
2. The rapid growth of graduate study and faculty research places an increasingly heavy burden on the university library;
3. The university library must modernize or perish, and modernization includes state, regional, and national cooperation;
4. Communications, including information retrieval, will largely determine the welfare of the library of the future;

5. Congress's acquisitions programs, regional resource storage centers, and centralized cataloging are absolute necessities of the future; and

6. The shortage of librarians is crucial, suggesting the need for more and more Federal support for (a) scholarships, (b) material resources, (c) physical plants, and (d) more library schools with improved, updated curriculums and teachers who are eager and willing to innovate rather than imitate.

The Commission is now putting the finishing touches on its final Report which will be submitted to the President within a month. In addition, the Commission is also preparing a supplementary volume based on the materials gathered during the last two years. The latter, which will be published in the fall, will contain a chapter on libraries and the university by Dr. Knight, who is also general editor of the volume.

I have not seen the manuscript of the Report, but my familiarity with the public hearings, plus my knowledge of the personal opinions of some of the Commission members, lead me to believe that in it the university library, as such, will receive light treatment. Rather, focus will be centered on research libraries in general, including university libraries. Specifically, the central idea in the Report is that all research libraries, large and small, somehow fall short of fulfilling their complete mission and thus need help of all kinds: more space, more personnel, more equipment (to effect automation), more materials, and more money from both public and private sources. If they do not get this help, the library as a significant social institution in our society will eventually be doomed.

In summary, throughout the nation the Subcommittee on Public Hearings found the following major viewpoints most frequently expressed:

1. The need for greater strengthening of America's public libraries in order to make them centers of learning in fact, instead of in name;
2. The need for a permanent national commission on libraries to look after the welfare and progress of all types of libraries;
3. The conversion of the Library of Congress into a truly national library of the United States;
4. The full acceptance of the powers and position of the U.S. Office of Education in the development of national library services;
5. The undergirding of state library agencies in order that they may properly function as the focal point for coordination of all public library activity both upward to the Federal level and downward to the urban and rural levels in each state in the Union; and
6. The need for more and better educated professional librarians, broadly discussed under the general and over-riding topic of "Manpower Shortage."

One final conclusion should be mentioned. The role of all libraries in the nation (school, college, university, public, and special) must inevitably change with the changing times—or perish. And this change, among other things, suggests considerable soul-searching on the part of librarians, a soul-searching that will eventually lead to perceptive reappraisals of our profession and in all probability significant redirections of our day-to-day efforts.

TUCSON PUBLIC LIBRARY,
Tucson, Ariz., March 17, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Please be congratulated for having taken the lead in the effort to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

I have read the text of the proposed bill and have found no basis for disapproval or for suggesting improvements.

Being strongly persuaded that the coordination of our libraries and information centers is of national interest, I would wish to assure you that we are interested in giving you whatever assistance you may require, to the extent that we are able to provide such.

Yours sincerely,

FRANK VAN ZANTEN, *Director.*

CALIFORNIA LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
Berkeley, Calif., March 24, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I appreciated your invitation to comment on the bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes.

I believe that the establishment of such a commission is of vital importance in meeting the national need for information through libraries in the 20th Century.

To enable information to be provided through libraries on a need to know basis, there must be planning and advising at the National level. The proposed commission will provide that planning and advisory services in the area of assessing the informational needs of the Nation.

Libraries are vital in the providing of informational resources to the Nation as they are essential links in the National communication networks.

If the California Library Association can provide written testimony of a helpful nature, we shall be pleased to do so.

Sincerely yours,

PHYLLIS I. DALTON, *President.*

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 8, 1969.*

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, House Select Education Subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BRADEMAS: I am writing in support of H.R. 8839 and the companion S. 1519, bills to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

As a librarian, I am well aware that libraries are increasingly invaluable resources to our communities. At the same time, the full potential of the library resources of the United States will not be realized without cooperation between libraries in the areas of acquisition, cataloging, and sharing materials, to name only three of the major problems facing all libraries. A National Commission on Libraries and Information Science ought to provide the leadership for solution of these problems, without which the full potential of our library resources cannot be realized.

I urge you and your colleagues to support this necessary legislation.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. KING,
Head, Circulation Department, Library, Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California, Los Angeles.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *March 25, 1969.*

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: My congratulations to you for introducing H.R. 8839 to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

I have read the copy of the bill you sent and as a professional librarian, I agree with you that it will answer a long felt need for libraries in the United States.

I have written to Senator Yarborough also concerning his bill S1519 which he introduced in the Senate and which I understand is identical to yours. I have also written to my senator, Mr. Alan Cranston, asking him to cosponsor Senator Yarborough's bill.

Thank you for your interest in libraries in the United States.

I am,

Very truly yours,

[illegible]

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY,
San Francisco, Calif., March 17, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I very much appreciate receiving your letter and a copy of your bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

We very much need to have such a Commission and I am particularly pleased that your bill makes this Commission an independent one within the Executive Branch. I think the Commission needs this strength even though its activities will certainly be closely related to Health, Education and Welfare.

At this point I do not see any problems in the proposed bill but if I should have further thoughts, I will contact you at an early date. Meanwhile, I shall by writing friends of mine in the House of Representatives asking that they be concerned with this bill and to lend their support to it.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. ANDERSON, *City Librarian.*

SAN MARINO PUBLIC LIBRARY,
San Marino, Calif., March 20, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: Thank you for sending me the information on the bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science that you introduced on March 12, 1969.

It is gratifying to learn that this forward moving legislation will be enacted and that the libraries of the United States may look to the Commission for leadership and support.

We librarians applaud your endeavors and pledge our support in any way it may be needed.

Yours sincerely,

JUNE E. BAYLESS,
President-elect PLA.

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CORP.,
Santa Monica, Calif., April 11, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, House Select Subcommittee on Education,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BRADEMAS: I understand that the House Select Subcommittee on Education is considering H.R. 8839 to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Both as an interested citizen and as a member of the former National Advisory Commission on Libraries, I would like to support the intent of H.R. 8839. I am particularly pleased to see that this bill establishes the commission as "an independent agency within the Executive Branch." You may know that in my report to COSATI regarding scientific and technical information handling we analyzed at some length the problems associated with establishing a monitoring agency in the library and information science area. We came to the conclusion that an independent agency in the Executive Branch was required rather than an organization as a part of one of the existing departments or agencies.

While I am pleased that you and your associates have introduced H.R. 8839, I cannot help but note that your bill does not embody the other major recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. It seems to me that the mere establishment of a national commission will not accomplish the major thrust that needs to take place in this total area. I hope that you or your subcommittee are considering legislation to implement several of the other recommendations of the Commission.

As you undoubtedly know, Representative Pucinski has introduced H.R. 8809 to establish a National Science Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval System. I have been asked to testify regarding this bill. After I have completed my testimony, I will take the liberty of transmitting a copy to you, which you may wish to consider in connection with H.R. 8830.

Sincerely yours,

Launor F. Carter,
Vice President and Manager, Public Systems Division.

University of California, Berkeley,
Berkeley, Calif., March 17, 1969.

Hon. John Brademas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear John: I am responding to your letter of March 12, 1969 concerning your proposed bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. I am convinced that such a Commission could make a substantial improvement in our developing library and information systems. Within the next decade the economic and technical state-of-the-art should bring us much closer to automated information systems which will involve commercial enterprise as well as libraries. It seems essential that we have a National Commission to assist in guiding this development and establishing priorities for action.

I particularly favor your view that the Commission should be based in the Executive Branch. This locus is much to be preferred over the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where it would be submerged in the bureaucracy. I have quickly reviewed the language of the proposed bill and find no questions except the lack of specific provision for a permanent staff to assist the Commission. Perhaps this provision is not necessary.

Cordially yours,

James E. Skipper,
University Librarian.

The Stanford University Libraries,
Stanford, Calif., March 17, 1969.

Hon. John Brademas,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Brademas: We appreciate your sending the bill of March 12th proposing to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Since you invite comment, let me make a few points.

This bill is indeed an exceedingly important action from the point of view of all types of libraries within the United States. The problems in developing institutions of higher education are formidable but it would be most short-sighted to regard the larger university libraries as having already achieved a satisfactory level of service and an adequate base of support. This is not the case; and the prospects that such a Commission could encourage research, financial support, technical and statistical studies, and other means which would be of substantial, demonstrable and immediate value to university libraries leads me to send support in the hope that this bill may be passed and the appropriations increased in future years as may be justifiable and possible.

A few specific points in the bill raise questions in my mind. Under Section 5(a)(5), I would think it useful to make specific reference after the word "Federal" to the U.S. Office of Education in which the Division of Library Programs has played a limited but important role. It would certainly be mandatory that the National Commission and the Office of Education's Division of Library Programs work closely together in an atmosphere of mutual respect and collaborative effort.

Under Section 5(a)(6), it would seem to me that merely "promoting" these activities might not be strong enough to insure the kind of action that the Commission ought to take. I believe they ought to "conduct" activities, either by their own staff efforts or on the contractual basis which is mentioned in the next subsection.

Under Section 6(a), the term of office is mentioned but not the possibility of renewal. I would think it desirable to authorize renewal but to limit it to a second five year term or portion thereof (in case the first term is begun as a replacement for a person who had to resign because of health or other reasons).

In Section 6(b), the word "Secretary" is not clear. This may mean Secretary of the Commission rather than the Office of Health, Education, and Welfare; this ought to be made explicit.

Finally, I see nothing in the bill which speaks of the Executive Officer. This will be a most important post and I believe the bill should make mention of the title, means of appointment, term, and function of this officer of the Commission.

In hopes that this will receive early attention and full backing in the Congress,

Cordially yours,

DAVID C. WEBER, *Associate Director.*

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY,
Fort Collins, Colo., March 19, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: We appreciate the information regarding the plans to introduce a bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as outlined in your letter of March 12.

We in the Rocky Mountain west and in Colorado particularly heartily endorse your proposal. We have long passed the juncture in development of library and information resources whereby the concentration of problems by some type of national advisory and coordinating commission is necessary. The recommendation of the President's National Advisory Commission to create this Commission has been well received in this region. It augurs well toward our goal of providing basic library and informational services and resources to an increasingly complex society.

Although we have nothing specific to suggest regarding the text of the proposed legislation at this date, we shall be pleased to comment in the future as new points-of-view come to our attention. In the meantime, if we can answer particular questions as to the advantages to citizens of this segment of the country, which the legislation would provide, please free to call upon us.

Best wishes for success in your important work.

Sincerely yours,

LE MOYNE W. ANDERSON, *Director of Libraries.*

HARTFORD PUBLIC LIBRARY,
Hartford, Conn., March 14, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Thank you for your letter of March 12 concerning the bill which you and others are introducing to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. I am very pleased, as a public librarian of thirty years experience, that efforts will be made to establish a Commission whose stated interest and responsibility is the libraries of the United States. Such a Commission should in time be able to bring an understanding to our society of the need which it has for expanded and improved library services to be made available equally to all our citizens. Today the "have-nots" and the "inadequate-haves" depend heavily on the few "haves" to the extent that even the best resources and services are diluted unreasonably.

I have always had difficulty in understanding our comparative willingness to put large amounts each year into the education of our children and young people in elementary and high school, and the willingness of parents to send their children to college at great personal sacrifice (and I speak from experience on this) while apparently caring little what facilities are available for the use of this education in adult life. Our libraries are really the only institutions where adults can pursue a program of self education. It is difficult for the adult to do this in many areas of the country with libraries as they are at present. For example, we are spending about $600 per year to educate our elementary and high school students, a total of about $8,000 for thirteen years. Those who continue in college to a first degree must expend at least $2,000 per year, another $8,000. We offer these young people libraries which are being supported at the per capita per annum rate of nothing, 50 cents, $1.50, $3.00, $5.00 and even in unusual cases $8–$10 per capita. When these support levels are contrasted, there is little logic in the support given to the average public library.

I don't want you to receive the impression that I think education is being supported unduly. The condition of our cities makes it perfectly obvious that all of the local, state and federal support for education is still completely inadequate.

You invited comments. I hope you find mine in favor of establishing the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science pertinent to your aims.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN G. JACKSON, *Librarian.*

THE FERGUSON LIBRARY,
Stamford, Conn., April 1, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Thank you for your letter of March 12 concerning the bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

We in the library profession have been following this development with great interest. A National Commission should supply a strong voice for the libraries of the country, something which has always been lacking. It should also help unify the development of American libraries and properly channel their many interests.

Thank you for your interest in this bill and we will all hope for its success.

Sincerely yours,

MARIE V. HURLEY, *Director.*

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE,
Newark, Del., March 18, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: Thank you very much for sending me your letter enclosing a copy of your bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

As the director of a university library and a member of the Council and Executive Board of the American Library Association, I am thoroughly cognizant of the need for improvement in the library and information science programs for this nation. I believe that the establishment of a permanent commission, such as you propose in your bill, will greatly aid the progress of Library and Information Science. An overall planning and coordinating body such as this has long been needed.

I shall write to the congressman and members of the Senate from Delaware to urge their full support of this bill in their respective houses.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. DAWSON, *Director of Libraries.*

DELAWARE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
Wilmington, Del., March 17, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: I am pleased to hear that a Bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science was introduced in the House under your auspices on March 12, 1969.

Both as a working librarian and, for the moment, as the President of the Delaware Library Association, I am constantly aware of the need for such a commission to coordinte the planning activities of all levels of government and all types of library service.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Congressman Roth with a request that he give the Bill the most serious consideration.

Cordially,

CHRISTOPHER B. DEVAN, *President.*

COUNCIL ON LIBRARY RESOURCES, INC.,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1969.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I have been informed that the Select Subcommittee on Education of the House of Representatives is about to hold hearings on H.R. 8839, a bill to establish a national commission on libraries and information science.

As a member of the U.S. National Advisory Commission on Libraries. 1966–8, and as one of the co-authors of the report to the President (*Library Services for the Nation's Needs*, July 1968) which recommended the establishment of a permanent library commission, I would like to be recorded as in support of the bill, and would very much appreciate it if you will make this letter a part of the record of the hearings which you are about to open.

I warmly endorse the purpose of the bill. It is my convinced opinion that the educational, cultural, political, scientific, technical, industrial, commercial—in summary the moral and material—welfare of the United States is and will be increasingly involved with the excellence of the library services available to the people of the United States and the extent to which these services are used. The bill will, in my opinion, take a major step in assuring the adequacy of available library services and in promoting their use.

The legislative objectives which I consider to have the highest priority in this connection at this time are the following:

1. The enunciation of a national library policy. It should be clearly stated (as recommended by the Commission) to be national policy that the American people should be provided with library services adequate to their needs and that the Federal government, in collaboration with State and local governments and private agencies, should take leadership in assuring the provision of such services.

2. The establishment of a continuing national commission on libraries to serve as the central planning and advisory body for carrying out national library policy. It is my opinion that (as stated in the Commission's report) the establishment of such a commission is the most important single measure that can be devised for carrying out the national library policy recommended in paragraph 1, above.

3. The effectiveness of the contining national commission on libraries will be dependent on its powers. I feel especially strongly about the following:

(*a*) The commission should be charged (as recommended in the Report) with responsibility for preparing full-scale plans for dealing with the Nation's library and information needs.

(*b*) The commission should be charged (as recommended in the Report) with responsibility for advising the Federal, State and local governments, as well as private agencies, institutions and groups with respect to the Nation's library and information needs.

(*c*) The commission should be empowered (as recommended in the Report) to conduct or have conducted such studies as are necessary to the fulfillment of its responsibilities.

(*d*) As recommended in the Report, the commission should report at least once a year to the President and to the Congress, and its report should be published. *I strongly recommend that the requirement for the publication of its report be written into the law.*

Sincerely yours,

VERNER W. CLAPP, *Consultant.*

Georgetown University Library,
Washington, D.C., April 7, 1969.

Hon. **John Brademas,**
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Brademas: As a University Librarian, I must commend you for your sponsorship of H.R. 8839, which, hopefully, will result in the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

I support wholeheartedly your endeavors to get this Bill passed into law.

Warmest personal regards,

Sincerely,

Joseph E. Jeffs, *Librarian.*

The Florida State University,
Robert Manning Strozier Library,
Tallahassee, April 8, 1969.

Hon. **John Brademas,**
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Brademas: Just a note to express to you my appreciation for all you are doing for better library service in the United States. I want you to know that librarians and educators in Florida are behind you 100 per cent.

Sincerely,

N. Orwin Rush, *Director.*

The Florida State University,
Robert Manning Strozier Library,
Tallahassee, March 19, 1969.

Hon. **John Brademas,**
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Brademas: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science which you recently introduced in Congress. First I wish to congratulate you on this action and your support of libraries.

It has been my understanding that apparently the National Advisory Commission was appalled at the state of the art of libraries, especially smaller public and smaller college libraries. Places with inadequate collections that were open only a few hours each week made up a large chunk of "libraries" in the United States. Students here obviously did not have the same resources and would suffer as a result. It seemed to them that although the literature reflected the need and desire of libraries to achieve greater cooperation, very little progress had been made. Few states had taken the initiative to raise standards and fewer still had set up channels of cooperation. Since state organizations had not been able to achieve much progress, a national Commission that would be aware of developments across the country and could make recommendations might, perhaps, be more successful.

It seems to me that this Commission, since it will obviously be quite powerful, has a chance to really advance librarianship. For instance, nation-wide standards regarding salaries, hours, and vacations could be drawn up. Also a personnel classification tailored to the library situation exclusively could be recommended. The result would be an authoritative tool to be used by library administrators with budgeting agencies. The above would not be as important to university libraries as it would to municipal and state libraries where there exist few realistic concepts of today's libraries and librarians, and the business of librarianship is based on precedent. Thus the system perpetuates with few alterations.

Another area which the Commission might tackle is the development of systems of cooperation. By this I mean the actual working out of a network of interlibrary loans whereby the smaller public libraries could draw from the resources of larger libraries. These in turn could seek help from a university library, which could share the collections of a larger university, etc. This sort of a network could, I am sure, point up the libraries that are heavily used for interlibrary loans, and these then could have some federal funding. As it stands now, although sharing of resources exists and is, perhaps, one of the more successful examples of library cooperation, the act of borrowing is an extremely slow and frustrating process. With federal support this may improve considerably and cooperation across city and state lines be enhanced.

Some coordination is also needed in information retrieval and data control in general. Much time and money have already been wasted in individual efforts at computerized systems and information retrieval. One example of this is the Universty of Buffalo catalog on tape in Mark I format which has lost much of its usefulness since Mark II format was adopted. Some forethought, communication and coordination may have rendered this a very useful endeavor.

Libraries on the whole seem to act to remedy the immediate problem with little thought of the future. The Commission through coordinating, consulting and recommended funding on the federal level should be able to raise standards of library operation across the country.

Sincerely yours,

N. ORWIN RUSH, *Director.*

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Atlanta, Ga., March 18, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I have read with interest your proposed bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

I commend you for your vision in seeing the need for such legislation, and I also congratuate you on the format and content of the proposed bill.

My sincere personal thanks to you for supporting this endeavor, and I pledge any assistance which I may render in this matter.

Sincerely,

CARLTON J. THAXTON, *Chief, Public Library Service.*

SOUTHEASTERN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
Atlanta, Ga., April 9, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, House Select Education Subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: On behalf of the Southeastern Library Association, I should like to express to you our extreme interest in the proposed National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

We are concerned that Libraries are having a difficult time acquiring and making available to those who need it the ever-expanding world of knowledge and information. We feel that the establishment of the National Commission will provide a national body to which common problems, needs and possible solutions can be referred.

Since we in the southeast have generally a lower level of economy than some other parts of the nation, we especially feel the need to coordinate our academic, public, special and school libraries so that all of our people may have access to the information they need to make them better citizens, politically, socially and economically.

We hope that such a Commission might be able to set goals of what could best be done nationally, what should be done regionally and what should be left to the individual states.

We appreciate your interest in libraries as a vital part of our nation.

Sincerely yours,

ELAINE VON OESEN, *President.*

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO,
Moscow, Idaho, March 19, 1969.

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: I am writing in response to your letter of March 12 concerning the bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

As the newly-appointed Federal Relations Coordinator for the Idaho Library Association, I wish to commend you for your action in introducing this bill and to assure you of my whole-hearted support.

I have read with care the report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, and, in my opinion, the recommendation in that report with the greatest significance and potential is that concerning the establishment of a National Commission. I am convinced that only from the perspective of a national view, and only with wise and continuing national leadership, can the vexatious problems confronting libraries of all kinds find solution. Consequently, I am very pleased to learn that this recommendation is now embodied in a bill.

I hope that your efforts on behalf of better library service will meet with success.

Sincerely,

WARREN S. OWENS, *Director.*

CHAMPAIGN PUBLIC LIBRARY,
Champaign, Ill., March 25, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: Thank you for your letter and for the copy of the bill and for introducing the bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. This is very important and will go far to improve the service that libraries are able to offer their patrons.

Sincerely yours,

KATHRYN J. GESTERFIELD, *Librarian.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY,
Chicago, Ill., March 18, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Thank you very much for sending me a copy of the bill you are introducing to create a permanent national commission on libraries and information science.

I hope the bill will receive wide support.

With very best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN H. FUSSLER, *Director.*

THE JOHN CRERAR LIBRARY,
Chicago, Ill., April 8, 1969.

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
South Bend, Ind.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: It is most gratifying to learn of the introduction in the Congress of H.R. [illegible], a bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. The report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries pinpointed the need for fixing responsibilities and objectives in such matters.

In their daily professional work, librarians and information scientists are keenly aware of the mounting pressures and problems of serving the educational, recreational and research needs of people in all walks of life. Information is the sustenance of our culture and our civilized progress and requires assured transmission and access. In the same way that our highways and mails are vital to our nation's welfare, so information must travel freely through libraries and other channels, to all who require it and from age to age.

I urge your support of this legislation in bringing this surety to pass.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM S. BUDINGTON,
Executive Director and Librarian.

SUBURBAN LIBRARY SYSTEM,
Western Springs, Ill., March 19, 1969.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Thank you for your part in promoting the bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

There is no doubt in my mind of the need for such a commission to coordinate the use of all the nation's information resources.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER L. STOFFEL, *Executive Director.*

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
Bloomington, Ind., March 19, 1969.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I appreciate your personal letter and explanation of the bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

Indiana University and its library, together with all academic institutions and libraries, will benefit from the establishment of the Commission and the national focus that it will give to a coordinated development of library and informational services.

Most particularly, this University and this library needs the advice, direction and support that the Commission can give to the sixth function, an interlibrary network of communication and information handling. The major libraries of the country are on the threshold of tremendous possibilities with the sharing of automation and communication technology. Our major need, at this time, is standardization of machinery, procedure and technique. Without national direction, we have already wasted talent and resources in duplication of programs and experimentation. The budget, or funds, available to this library should not be expended in a one-library solution if a national solution can be realized. A one-library solution may not only be eventually negated but it adds nothing to the national need.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT A. MILLER, *Director of Libraries.*

INDIANA STATE LIBRARY,
Indianapolis, Ind., March 27, 1969.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Thank you for your letter of March 12 and the enclosed copy of your bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

The bill you propose is a step forward in providing for the educational needs of our nation. Libraries of all types, public, school, special and academic, are cooperating in an effort to give library service to all citizens but more help is needed in meeting this goal. Your proposed bill creating a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science will further library cooperation on all levels and will aid in the betterment of education throughout the country.

The Library Services and Construction Act has provided much needed funds to give expanded and improved library service to citizens in the United States. This federal program has never been fully funded as provided for in the Act. It is hoped that this can be achieved in the future in order that much needed library improvements can be made in all states.

Thank you for your interest in libraries and their vital role in the educational development of our country.

Sincerely,

Abbie Heitger, *Head, Extension Division.*

INDIANA STATE LIBRARY,
Indianapolis, Ind., April 7, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I very much appreciated receiving a copy of your bill for the establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. I have discussed this with a number of our librarians in Indiana, and have found nothing but enthusiasm and support for such a bill. They are all pleased with the interest which you have shown throughout the years in the welfare of libraries and are willing at this time to do anything that they can to support you in your sponsorship of further legislation. Please feel free to call on us at the State Library for information or service.

Sincerely,

Marcelle K. Foote, *Director.*

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
Lafayette, Ind., April 1, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Thank you for supporting the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. We need persons from the broad fields of education research and communications to give leadership to educational resources, libraries and networks of knowledge.

May I suggest that "not more than five members of the commission shall be professional librarians or information specialists" be interpreted to be one for each type of library service (college and university, public, special and school) and an information scientist so that each service area is assured representation.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Carolyn I. Whitenack,
Professor and Chairman, Educational Media.

LOGANSPORT PUBLIC LIBRARY,
Logansport, Ind., April 2, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I wish to add my thanks to those of Germaine Krettek of the American Library Association for your introduction of H.R. 8839, a bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. It is heartening evidence that Congress is aware of the ever-increasing importance of libraries to the necessary intellectual growth of the nation.

(4)

It is particularly gratifying to me personally that you, as a Representative of our state of Indiana, have demonstrated an enlightened concern in this matter. Many thanks.

Sincerely yours,

Michael Cart,
Federal Relations Co-Ordinator, Indiana Library Association; Director, Logansport-Cass County Public Library.

University of Notre Dame,
Notre Dame, Ind., March 15, 1969.

Hon. John Brademas,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Brademas: I was very pleased to receive your letter and learn that you have introduced the bill to create a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Last year, at the mid-winter meeting of the Association of Research Libraries, I heard a report on the work of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. I was convinced at that time that a permanent Commission should be created. I am delighted that this goal may soon be realized, and especially pleased that you, our Representative, have taken such an active interest.

Since you have already conferred extensively with representatives of the library profession and received expert advice from them, there is little I can add in the way of specific comment. I will only say that I am in complete sympathy with the general aims and particular provisions of the bill. The Commission, if approved, will be an invaluable means to coordinate our efforts and resources as we try to cope with the so-called "information explosion."

Thank you for your letter and for the copy of the bill.

Yours sincerely,

James W. Simonson, C.S.C.,
Director of Libraries.

South Bend, Ind., *March 27, 1969.*

Hon. John Brademas,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Brademas: I wish to thank you for the copy of the bill which was recently introduced and referred to the Select Subcommittee of Education, concerning the creation of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

It is commendable indeed to bring to the attention of the nation the necessity of supporting the libraries and information centers and to develop statements and utilization plans. However, I see two problems which might arise if this bill is not modified before passage.

(1) It is difficult to understand the preponderance of members of the commission whose primary responsibility and therefore primary knowledge is not in the area of information retrieval. Librarians, I am sure, feel very deeply the need to be sensitive to the needs of our society and wish to have these needs voiced in making policy statements on library services, but it is unrealistic to feel that there is need for the commission to be represented by only ⅓ professionals. The percentage should include ⅔ members whose prime responsibility is that of working actively in libraries and information centers. If the schools of library science are to be represented these people should be thought of as representing higher education and not libraries per se. To have less than ⅔ for library services implies that libraries do not represent society in any measure.

(2) In Sec. 5(a)(2) it is stated that surveys, studies and analysis will be made of all libraries including elementary and secondary school libraries. If this is a commendable proposal then there are two other facets which should be included. The recommendation for school libraries must come through the State School Officer in each state. School libraries would be in an untenable position if they were to have rules and regulation imposed upon them from an agency outside the State School Officer's jurisdiction. The second discrepancy refers again to the composition of the commission. This commission must include one practicing school librarian at the elementary or secondary level.

Special needs are met in the school library which must be expressed in determining any program as far reaching as the one which you propose. I appreciate your consideration of the items set forth in this letter.

It is my understanding that hearings will be held on or about April 14. I would be interested in knowing the names of the persons that will testify and their vocational positions.

Cordially,

Mary Ellen Luebke,
Librarian, Harrison School.

West Lafayette, Ind., *March 17, 1969.*

Hon. John Brademas,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Brademas: Your bill on "A National Commission on Libraries and Information Science and for other purposes" can have from me at once the warmest and most immediate gratitude. I thank you heartily for introducing it. I'll think it over and may write you any second thoughts that occur to me. But I want to get this to you promptly.

Gratefully,

John H. Moriarity,
Director of Libraries and Audio-Visual Center, Purdue University.

South Bend Public Library,
South Bend, Ind., April 3, 1969.

Hon. John Brademas,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear John: I am heartily in favor of your bill which it seems to me you explained and justified admirably in your "extended remarks" which preceded the text of H.R. 8839 in the *Congressional Record* of March 12, 1969 (H 1657). Further, the report of the President's National Advisory Commission on Libraries also urged such a permanent national commission as the "most important single measure" that could be taken to develop library services to meet the nation's needs, as you also stated in your remarks accompanying your bill.

The President's National Advisory Commission's report again and again pointed out why a permanent National Commission on Libraries is needed as it responded to each of the four charges contained in the President's Executive Order of September 2, 1966 creating the Advisory Commission. I will refrain from repeating the points made; that Advisory Committee report speaks strongly and thoroughly on the need.

I wish to express my personal thanks to you for your interest over the past years in library services of all kinds (public, academic, school and special) and for your leadership now in following up what is the prime need and the chief recommendation of the President's National Advisory Commission.

Sincerely yours,

Roger B. Francis,
Director.

Kansas State Teachers College,
Emporia, Kans., March 19, 1969.

Mr. John Brademas,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Brademas: I read today with interest your advisory letter of March 12, concerning the introduction of a bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. It seems to me, as I read the accompanying bill, that this should help the cause of libraries and information services in a way that has been needed for a long time.

Thank you for your interest and efforts. I wish you every success in this endeavor.

Sincerely yours,

Graham H. Sadler,
Associate Professor, Division of Librarianship.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS LIBRARIES,
Lawrence, Kans., March 17, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: Thank you for your March 12 letter and the enclosed text of a bill to establish a National Commission for Libraries and Information Science.

It is an important piece of legislation, and I respectfully offer my thanks for your introducing it.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID W. HERON, *Director.*

TOPEKA PUBLIC LIBRARY,
Topeka, Kans., March 17, 1969.

JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Thank you for sending me a copy of the bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. I appreciated the opportunity to read this proposed act in its entirety—and I did so twice!

It seems to me that a potentially valuable service to the entire library and information science effort in this nation could come from such a Commission, with adequate funding and staffing—and they are inseparable. I have noted the Section 7 request for an authorized appropriation of $500,000.00 for the first fiscal year ending June 30, 1970. This seems a modest beginning and should not be controversial although I doubt it will be adequate over the coming years. I do have concerns that an expenditure here might, in some way, lessen the now somewhat impoverished programs which the library profession has struggled to achieve (along with the Congress, gratefully), particularly the various titles of the *Library Services and Construction Act* and the *ESEA* titles for library development. I am afraid that the tremendous gap between library services being offered and those needed for modern library service is still large and the requirement is still for MORE.

I would like to add my name to those who vigorously support this contemplated legislation, whose very success will also involve the adequate funding of the other library titles mentioned above. We all, working in libraries and recipients of their services, appreciate the effort which you are making—and your colleagues— to improve this vital educational and humanitarian endeavor and I wish to offer to you my sincerest thanks.

By the way, the chairman of our Board of Trustees, William E. Treadway (head of the Santa Fe Legal Department) is a former Hoosier and, I believe, four-term member of the Indiana House. He has just given to the library, a beautiful landscape of Brown County, Indiana by Theodore Fox—who is probably known to you.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. MARVIN, *Librarian.*

ENOCH PRATT FREE LIBRARY,
Baltimore, Md., March 19, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: Thank you for sending the bill you are introducing to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. I am convinced this bill, if passed and signed by the President, will be an important step forward in the development of better library service for all of the people of the United States.

As I looked over the provisions of the bill, it seemed to follow closely the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission. And I cannot find anything in the bill that is a cause for concern.

It has been a pleasure to observe for a number of years your increasing interest in library service. I have testified before your committee and have been impressed by your understanding. I know that your powerful support has been effective in the passage of much important library legislation. It is good to know that you are a champion of a cause that is essential to the educational advancement of the country and to assuring access to information by all who need it.

Thanks again for your thoughtfulness in sending the bill and good luck in all your future public services. If I can be helpful in any way in connection with this bill, I will be glad to do so.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN CASTAGNA, *Director*.

THE MILTON S. EISENHOWER LIBRARY,
THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,
Baltimore, Md., April 3, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I was deeply interested and greatly encouraged to hear that you, with other members of the House of Representatives, will introduce a bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

The need for such a Commission, at this period in history, is becoming increasingly apparent. I see no way of satisfying the growing appetite of scholarship unless meaningful plans for regional and national library and information networks are developed. The Commission your bill describes would provide the instrument for creating such networks.

Please accept my congratulations for the thoughtful approach you and your colleagues have made to this problem.

With best wishes for the success of your proposal, I am

Respectfully,

JOHN H. BERTHEL, *Librarian*.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND,
SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICES,
College Park, Md., March 18, 1969.

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: It was very kind of you to arrange for me to receive notice of your intention to introduce the bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and of the likelihood that the Select Subcommittee on Education, which you chair, shall be holding hearings on this prospective legislation soon. I applaud this effort and I very much support the intent of the proposed legislation. I know that your Committee shall be hearing from the formal organizations and I shall therefore not say anything that would merely repeat the perspective of the bodies which firmly and committedly promote library service in the culture. But I would like to make a point that I am not sure would be made by any of the organized bodies. It is very simply and honestly this. There are many who are identified with librarianship who feel that libraries as they are presently constituted simply are not responding to contemporary social or intellectual needs of their constituencies. In the public library, the traditional business-as-usual tends to be the response at a time when the community to be served by libraries is in a state of extraordinary ferment. The programs and services of the conventional public library, for the most part, tend to be irrelevant to the needs of many elements within the culture.

In the academic milieu, the libraries are not able to keep up with the contemporary requirements of scholarship, research or student need, not merely because of limits on the resources which they have available, (although this may be a factor), but because traditional librarianship is not geared to the nature of modern scholarly requirements and to the dramatic variations which are being made in forms and types of media through which intelligence is being generated in these times. The traditional library response as reflected by its organized groups is simply to seek more resources. But, I submit that the nature of the problems facing librarianship are too deep-seated to yield to simply increased numbers of dollars for acquisitions or physical plant. What is far more requisite is dramatic and innovative research, experimentation and demonstration of alternatives to contemporary arrangements. It is this which I find most heartening about the projected agenda for the proposed National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

Libraries and information services in the culture today fall desperately short of the needs now manifest for information and intelligence for community services, decision processes in government and business, and as support for research and scholarship in the universities and research centers. A formal body such as is contemplated by this legislation can be a powerful instrument to help propel this institution and this professional discipline forward and it is for these reasons that I most heartily and enthusiastically endorse the proposed legislation and the agenda for work which the legislation puts before this Commission.

I hope these remarks may be helpful.

All good wishes.

Sincerely,

PAUL WASSERMAN, *Dean.*

THE KENT-CAROLINE PUBLIC LIBRARIES ASSOCIATION,
Ridgely, Md., March 20, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

SIR: Thank you for your recent letter informing me of your sponsorship of H.R. 8839 to establish a national commission on libraries and information science.

Be assured that the Maryland Library Association looks upon the creation of a permanent commission as a vital step in the development of a truly national information network.

We are urging Senators Joseph D. Tydings and Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., to co-sponsor the companion bill, S 1519, and when the bill reaches the floor of the House of Representatives we will urge Maryland's delegation to give it wholehearted support.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM N. RAIRIGH,
Chairman, Federal Relations Committee, Maryland Library Association.

EDUCOM,
Boston, Mass., April 4, 1969.

Representative JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: I have just reviewed the bill which you proposed to submit on March 12th covering the permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

I believe that the bill appropriately deals with the importance of this area in our nation and commend you for your effort in bringing it about.

If there be anything that EDUCOM can do to help in this area, please rest assured of our interest and enthusiasm.

Sincerely yours,

JORDAN J. BARUCH, *President.*

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
BUREAU OF LIBRARY EXTENSION,
Boston, Mass., March 31, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: The Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners, at its monthly meeting of March 1969 voted to support H.R. 8839, the bill to establish a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. The State Library Commissioners, charged with the extension, improvement and encouragement of library services in the Commonwealth, are certainly behind legislation which provides for the establishment of a commission empowered to study and evaluate all library resources at a national level. We are in a position to realize the importance and necessity of proper utilization and coordination of all libraries and information services. HR 8839 appears to be the necessary step at this time to insure the proper action.

The Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries envisions giant strides in the ultimate improvement and availability of library resources and services for all the American people. Basic to such improvement is step No. 1—the establishment of a National Commission which would initiate the implementation of the several excellent recommendations contained in the 'National Report' itself.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD J. SULLIVAN,
Chairman, Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners.

THE LIBRARIES, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Cambridge, Mass., March 24, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Thank you for sending me a copy of your Bill—To Establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for Other Purposes. I find the Bill excellent and hope it will achieve speedy passage. May I compliment you particularly on the inclusion of information science as one of the primary purposes of the Commission.

May I make one or two minor suggestions. In Section 5(a), (2) 1.2 after "* * * needs of the nation" and in Section 5(a), (4) 1.2 after "* * * informational needs" might I suggest that you insert "including the need for specialized personnel." Adequately trained personnel is one of the major problems of the library and information field today. Therefore, I suggest that this be mentioned explicitly.

Concerning Section 6(a) on membership, might I suggest that the membership of the Commission include two librarians and four information scientists. Under the present wording there could be five librarians and no information specialists or vice versa. The great majority of librarians in the country are public librarians who have little knowledge of or interest in information science. Few if any information scientists have anything in common with public librarians. Information science includes librarianship as one of its subdisciplines. Therefore, it would be highly desirable that librarianship and information science be represented on the Commission by separate individuals.

I should be happy to appear before the Select Subcommittee on Education if you wish. As librarian of a research library, I and a hundred or so of my colleagues find myself at a point where librarianship and information science intersect. The Association of Research Libraries speaks for this group. As for the broader interests of information science, they are best represented by the American Society for Information Science. I hope both these associations will make presentations at your hearings.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM N. LOCKE,
Director of Libraries.

BOSTON COLLEGE,
Chestnut Hill, Mass., March 31, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: It was with much more than routine enthusiasm that I received your March 12 announcement of the introduction of a bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries. Even allowing for the bias engendered by twenty-two years as a librarian, I believe that there is strong objective support for the contention that libraries are probably the most flexible, extensive, and promising source of educational enrichment in the widest sense of the phrase which the country possesses. Any move, therefore, which strengthens this somewhat disjointed and under appreciated resource, and the Commission certainly has great potential toward this end, deserves the highest praise.

As you suggest, the several professional library associations will undoubtedly provide adequate testimony for hearings. In the unlikely event that there were anything I could offer additionally to the success of the bill or to the functioning of the ensuing Commission to offer my services.

Sincerely yours,

Father **Brendan Connolly**, S.J.,
Director of Libraries.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY,
Ann Arbor, Mich., March 19, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
2134 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Thank you for your letter of March 12 regarding your introducing a bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

The creation of such a Commission was by far the most important recommendation of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries and I should like to express my profound gratitude to you for your initiative in undertaking to implement that recommendation. In so doing you are performing a public service of great and lasting significance for the well-being of education, scholarship, industry and government in this country.

Respectfully yours,

Frederick H. Wagman, *Director.*

DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Detroit, Mich., April 1, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: Dr. Stuart C. Rankin, Executive Director of the Michigan-Ohio Regional Educational Laboratory (MOREL), has asked me to comment upon the bill which you and several of your colleagues have introduced to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Having read and reread the proposed bill, and having followed with interest the deliberations of both the Committee on Scientific and Technical Information (COSATI) and the reactive proposal of the Ad Hoc Joint Committee on National Library/Information Systems (CONLIS) on the same matter, I find your bill very much to my personal satisfaction. It represents, to my mind, a reasoned and reasonable approach to a critical problem regarding effective utilization of our national resources. Specifically I would like to offer the following observations:

> The key concept, in my view, is that we must provide the necessary library and information services to "achieve national goals and to utilize most effectively the nation's educational resources" (Section 2). With our vast educational needs (broadly defined) today we literally cannot afford to expend time and resources reworking the same ground or failing to gain from each other's experiences. Our needs are national and so information coordination must also be national.
>
> Defining education more narrowly, to the formal institution, there is increasing application of information handling techniques originally developed for science and technology to the literature of the field. The major example of this effort, of course, is the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). In the Midwest, like activities include those of the Michigan-Ohio Regional Educational Laboratory (Regional Information System), the Ohio Education Association's Association Referral Information Service, and the Wayne County (Michigan) Intermediate School District's ASSIST Center. While there is close communication between the last three mentioned programs and ongoing cooperation between them and ERIC, there remains a very real need to provide a broader type of coordination, not only among educational information services, but with allied areas in the social sciences and humanities. A national agency is necessary to accomplish this. As an example, I may soon have the task of creating a master

plan for educational information services in the State of Michigan. A national commission carrying out the functions included in your bill would be of inestimable value in this endeavor. In fact, it should be a necessity to accomplish national compatibility among such systems. Only in this way can attainment of our national goals be effectively gained.

I would make a plea for a very broad interpretation of the term "information." The one reservation I have about the CONLIS proposal is that it is couched mainly in terms of print resources. While not depreciating their great value, that information which can be obtained immediately and directed from human and institutional resources should also be taken into consideration. Information in print form, almost by definition, includes a time lag factor which reduces its freshness to some extent. The ongoing activities of persons and projects can be as current as a telephone call, however. In reality both immediate (face-to-face) and mediated information are necessary for intelligent decision making, both must be taken into account for maximum impact.

Placement of the proposed Commission within the Executive Branch, with operational support coming from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, neatly solves a rather delicate problem. The pervasive autonomy of the Executive Branch is available and yet a direct connection is maintained with the department through which informational services should be made available (HEW). I am curious as to the relationship of the Commission and COSATI under this arrangement. Will the Commission incorporate COSATI, coordinate it, or merely cooperate with it?

One unresolved question which I have after reading the proposal is the degree of authority which the Commission will have. The only prohibition to heed the opinions and directions of the Commission that I found in document was found in Section 5d where the heads of all Federal agencies are "directed to cooperate with the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this Act." Is this sufficient? It may well be some leverage is provided through fund coordination. A proposed solution to this problem, which has appealed to me, was that of the "responsible agent" as delineated in *Recommendations for National Document Handling Systems in Science and Technology* (Systems Development Corporation, 1965). The SDC study, done for COSATI, recommended both a "capping agency" (the Commission?) and agents in each department and organization who were responsible for the information activity of their agency. This would seemingly tie down responsibility and promote accountability.

My reactions have been somewhat random. In general I am extremely supportive of the proposed legislation. I hope my comments have been of value. If I can be of any assistance regarding passage and implementation of the bill please call on me. I would also like to be kept informed as to the bill's progress.

Sincerely,

George H. Grimes,
Supervisor, Curriculum Laboratories, Detroit Public Schools and Consultant, Information Services, Michigan-Ohio Regional Educational Laboratory.

Farmington District Library,
Farmington, Mich., March 17, 1969.

Hon. John Brademas,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Brademas: Many thanks for your letter of March 12 and attachment of Bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science and for other purposes.

This is much needed legislation, and very long overdue. I want to study the Bill and if I have any specific comments, I shall write you. I am just so very pleased that it is finally introduced, and with an interested Chairman as you are, delays in acting upon it should not occur.

Very sincerely,

Mary F. Allison,
Secretary, Board of Trustees,
Member, Oakland County Library Board.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
BUREAU OF LIBRARY SERVICES,
Lansing, Mich., March 24, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was pleased to read of your introducing House Bill #8839 which would create a permanent National Commission on Library and Information Science. Section 6(a) of the bill you introduced, stating that only five members of the committee shall be professional librarians or information specialists, is excellent. I believe it is important to library service that we have represented on the Commission individuals from other professions.

President Nixon, on October 22, 1968 said "in a world where knowledge is the key to leadership, a modern progressive library system is a vital national asset." I would like to add that funding of a modern progressive library is vital. Establishment of the Commission would help the library profession but progress will depend on the amount of funds allocated for library purposes. We need to have full funding for all Titles of the Library Services and Construction Act. Without this money no amount of recommendations or studies by the Commission will be of any value. We need this money to implement library services in all states.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT RAZ,
Institutional Library Consultant.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
BUREAU OF LIBRARY SERVICES,
Lansing, Mich., March 14, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I urge you to continue your efforts for the passage of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act. We desperately need a commission to inform the President and the Congress of the needs and importance of libraries throughout the nation.

We, in Michigan, will do everything we can to assist you, and I, personally, offer my services.

Sincerely,

DALE H. PRETZER,
Deputy State Librarian.

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC LIBRARY,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 28, 1969.

Representative JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BRADEMAS: I appreciate your letter of March 12, and the enclosure of the draft of a bill to establish a national commission on libraries and information science. Your support of such legislation is deeply appreciated by me and others in Minnesota.

Sincerely yours,

ERVIN J. GAINES, *Director.*

LINCOLN UNIVERSITY,
Jefferson City, Mo., March 29, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: My compliments to you and the nineteen Congressmen who introduced legislation to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (H.R. 8839). Certainly this proves your recognition of the importance of libraries in our modern society, and their importance to our way of life.

There are two major reasons, in my view, for the establishment of such a commission. Firstly, the demands being made upon libraries of today make their responsibility as great, if not greater, than the schools and the colleges themselves. Without them the teacher's effectiveness would be less, and the information available to the student would be minimal. Our's is the ideal type way of life and its security rests upon an informed people who can appreciate the many freedoms we enjoy.

Secondly, in order that libraries may be coordinated in such a way that their services are available to all, there needs to be further developed ways to bring this about, and in the least expensive way. Because librarians are so close to their work, I fear that they often do not see the wider scope of their services. As a professional librarian myself I have been appalled at the vast amount of waste of public funds brought about mainly through lack of cooperation and coordination of efforts.

The vast amount of printed materials available today requires a type of skill which must be exercised with care by librarians. To select the usable and the important from the many publications is a great public responsibility, and I hope librarians themselves will continue to develop guidelines as well as techniques for proper bibliographic controls. The changing demands of people and the advent of several new methods of communication all challenge the librarian, making many of the ideas held by many currently-practicing professionals obsolete. Even the colleges and universities have been charged with stereotyping and of offering education which is irrelevant to todays needs.

It is my hope that this legislation is passed and that this important body be composed of persons with broad insights into the problems facing us. And you, sir, are to be congratulated for having had the foresight to have seen the great need for the furtherance of our democratic way of life.

Sincerely yours,

A. P. MARSHALL,
University Librarian.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES,
St. Louis, Mo., April 7, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: I am writing to express my interest in H.R. 8839, the Bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

I feel strongly that there is an urgent need in the library field at this time for a permanent, high-level body which can evaluate existing programs, plan new programs to meet growing needs and coordinate the efforts of many agencies, both within and outside the government, which are working to supply the country's varied needs for library and information services.

I believe that the Commission envisaged in H.R. 8839 would serve these purposes, and I hope very much that you will endorse the Bill and work for its passage.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW J. EATON,
Director of Libraries.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
St. Louis, Mo., April 7, 1969.

Representative JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, House Select Subcommittee on Education, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BRADEMAS: As a member of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries and one of the authors of its Report, I write in support of H.R. 8839, the bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Let me give you my reasons for believing this is the fundamental step to bring about the goals for which the President established a National Advisory Commission on Libraries.

I am sure that you are well aware that national advisory commissions are outgrowths of the original Anglo-American jury concept—a group of citizens who determine the facts so that a government official (the judge or the sheriff) can act in accordance with these facts; and, secondarily, that this official's acts should reflect the informed opinion of the citizenry.

The original National Advisory Commission on Libraries took this charge very much to heart. It examined reams of facts and figures; it heard hundreds of citizen-witnesses; and it debated at great length the conclusions to be drawn from all of this. The term of this Commission, however, was only one year, and it was soon apparent that a large number of the problems were too vast to be dealt with satisfactorily in the time allotted. Moreover, the members of the Commission knew that the problem of libraries were not only not static, but that the acceleration in the speed of change in libraries in our lifetime would make conclusions reached today unsatisfactory conclusions for the future.

For these reasons the Commission unanimously felt that a continuing, high-level, non-political commission of citizens should be established to consider the problems of libraries in our society at regular intervals. In view of the importance of libraries as fundamental educational devices, as gadgets for the transmission of data, knowledge, and culture, and as a means for keeping this country in the forefront of discoveries, I hope that you will vigorously support H.R. 8839 to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

Sincerely yours,

ESTELLE BRODMAN, PH. D.,
Librarian and Professor of Medical History.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *February 19, 1969.*

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Education and Labor Committee, House of Representatives,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: I have been giving a great deal of thought to our conversation of Monday night. Because I am not familiar with, and have not worked with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I feel I am not qualified to testify on it. When we first discusesd this, afraid I misunderstood that your reference was to ESEA and not the Library Services and Construction Act. It would not be wise for me to appear before your committee on March 5.

I am a trustee of a public library and I am knoweldgeable on the Libary Services and Construction Act. I would be qualified to testify when your committee considers LSCA. The public library field is of vital concern to me and I have a crusading feeling about more and better public libraries. I would come to Washington to testify for it when those hearings get underway.

How we appreciate your conern for libraries We are proud of your interest and the concentrated efforts you have made to improve library service. Please forgive me for any inconvenience I may have caused you.

Sincerely,

MRS. R. D. WARDEN.

Montana State Library,
Helena, Mont., March 17, 1969.

Hon. John Brademas,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Brademas: Thank you for your letter of March 12th and the information that you are introducing a bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Be sure that we will do everything in our power to help to get favorable action on this excellent bill.

Most sincerely,

Mrs. Ruth O. Longworth, *Librarian.*

Nebraska Public Library Commission,
Lincoln, Nebr., March 18, 1969.

Representative John Brademas,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We are pleased that you are sponsoring a bill for the creation of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Sciences. We feel very strongly about the public library, and especially its role as an independent agency to work effectively with all groups, all age levels, all interests, etc. without being tagged with one particular agency (whether it be the education department, school, community center, etc.). It must be free to reach and change, develop, and alter direction as the need occurs. It can do this if it has a flexible role in governmental structure.

If grants for library service continue to remain under the Office of Education, I do hope that we can continue the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, with the naming of an Assistant Commissioner for Libraries.

We shall be pleased to hear of progress on the bill.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jane Pope Geske, *Consultant.*

Dartmouth College Libraries,
Hanover, N.H., April 1, 1969.

Hon. John Brademas,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Brademas: Thank you for the copy of the proposed bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. I am extremely pleased that such action on a national level is being proposed, and sincerely hope that the bill will become a reality.

There long has been a need for a coordinating force for the divergent library services and needs of the country, and the creation of a National Commission would be a giant step forward.

Sincerely,

Adelaide B. Lockhart,
Assistant Librarian.

Dartmouth College Libraries,
Hanover, N.H., April 4, 1969.

Hon. John Brademas,
750 Leland Avenue,
South Bend, Ind.

Dear Congressman Brademas: May I take this means of registering, as I have with your colleague Mr. Cleveland of the Second New Hampshire District, my keen interest in and support of H.R. 8839, which you have introduced before the

Congress. I hope it will be favorably reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor and acted upon affirmatively by the House.

Sincerely,

Edward Connery Lathem,
Librarian of the College.

Colby Junior College,
New London, N.H., March 19, 1969.

Congressman John Brademas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Brademas: Thank you for your letter of March 12, in which you enclosed a copy of your bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. It seems to me that this is a sound proposal, and I sincerely hope that it will be adopted.

Having served for a number of years on the Governor's Study Committee for library problems here in New Hampshire, I am convinced that anything we can do to further more adequate library service is in the public interest.

With best wishes to you, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

J. Duane Squires,
Chairman, Department of Social Studies.

New Jersey School Library Association,
Chatham, N.J., April 3, 1969.

Re H.R. 8839.

Hon. John Brademas,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Brademas: Thank you for forwarding to us a copy of your proposed bill establishing a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

The New Jersey School Library Association favors the bill because we agree that a national policy is needed in order to best serve the nation's needs in the area of libraries and information services. We too feel that this calls for the establishment of a continuing federal planning agency.

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science which you propose would be the answer to this pressing need.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. H. T. Thompson,
Legislative Chairman.

Johnson Free Public Library,
Hackensack, N.J., March 17, 1969.

Hon. John Brademas,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Brademas: Thank you very much for your letter of March 12 enclosing copy of proposed bill concerning establishment of a National Library Commission which I read with great interest. Officials of the American Library Association will present the considered opinion of all libraries; I am therefore refraining from any comments.

I wish to congratulate you on your timely initiative in introducing this legislation, and to wish you every success in your endeavors.

Respectfully yours,

Julius Ostromecki, *Director.*

BURLINGTON COUNTY LIBRARY,
Mount Holly, N.J., March 25, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: As Chairman of the Burlington County, New Jersey, Library Commission, I should like to state that the four Commissioners and I strongly favor the creation of a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. We, being from various heterogeneous sections of a county, realize the value of an over-all Commission on a National level.

May we extend our best wishes for success in the passage of such a bill.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. MARGARET S. HAINES,
Chairman, Burlington County Library Commission.

BRO-DART INDUSTRIES,
Newark, N.J., March 26, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Thank you very much for your letter dated March 12 in reference to the bill that you are introducing to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. I, too, am very pleased that your bill is being presented and I shall do everything in my power, if it is desired, to assist in this important Act.

I have had the honor of serving on one of the Advisory Committees to the National Advisory Commission on Libraries and I well recognize, because of that experience, the importance of this bill.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR BRODY, *President.*

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY,
Princeton, N.J., March 26, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I want to express my warm appreciation to you for your initiative in introducing a bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. The proposed Commission and the declaration by the Congress that library and information services are essential seems to me an important first step toward achieving the objectives recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Libraries.

Once more librarians and the vast numbers of individuals and organizations whom they serve have occasion to be grateful to you for your continuing interest and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM S. DIX,
University Librarian.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
STATE LIBRARY,
Trenton, N.J., March 20, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BRADEMAS: I am very pleased to have been asked to express my views with regard to the proposed legislation creating a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and I should like to extend my hearty congratulations to you for the excellent job done on it. Such a Commission should ensure that the widest possible attention is focused at the Federal level upon the structure and development of the kind of library resources and information network which is essential to our nation.

The Commission's proper role, as I see it, is in an advisory or staff capacity; in reporting to the President and the nation at large on the status, the needs, and the responsibilities of library and information system development. I am, therefore, anxious that its relationship to the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be as explicit as possible. I assume it is not intended that the Commission diminish the line responsibilities of the several offices within that agency which are devoted to library matters, such as the Division of Library Services and Educational Facilities, and the Library Studies Branch of the National Center for Educational Statistics. To lessen the duties of these agencies in the areas of planning, evaluation, research, promotion, and dissemination of information would be unfortunate, I feel, and the wording of the proposed bill could, perhaps, be clarified in this regard.

Subsection (6) of Section 5. (a) should be rewritten, I feel, from the standpoint of syntax: "essential links in the national communications networks" would seem to modify "capability", as now worded. I would suggest correcting and expanding this subsection to read:

"(6) promote research and development activities which will extend and improve knowledge of the status of the nation's libraries and information centers, and will foster its library and information-handling capability through the development of these essential links in the national communications network."

Insertion of the phrase, "improve knowledge of the status of the nation's libraries and information centers," is meant to reflect directly the concern of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries that:

The pitiful incompleteness and tardiness of library statistics, and their lack of comparability, make it impossible to give specific quantitative responses to this series of questions (p. 7, 323-763-14919).

. . . the National Center for Educational Statistics must be in a position to collect on a continuing basis the pertinent and adequate library data—urgently required and not now available—for an appraisal of present programs and formulating plans for the future (p. 20, ibid.).

I hope the foregoing will be helpful to you in reviewing the proposed bill. I am anxious, as I know you are, not only to see the Commission established on a permanent basis, but to see that its charge is clear, strong and as comprehensive as required. Your efforts on behalf of this legislation are deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

David C. Palmer,
Chief, Readers Services,
(Chairman, Statistics Coordinating
Committee, American Library Association).

Fordham University Library,
Bronx, N.Y., March 17, 1969.

Hon. **John Brademas,**
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Brademas: Thank you for your letter and the enclosure on the subject of a proposed National Advisory Commission on Libraries.

We are much indebted to you for your interest in this subject which is of such vital concern to higher education in America. The libraries of metropolitan New York City are hard pressed to meet the increasing demands which they experience daily. We take hope from the expression of national interest which your bill constitutes.

My position as chairman of the Library Use and Resources Committee of the New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Agency, Inc., has shown me above all else that our problems require the attention of the Federal Government if ever they are to be properly solved.

My warmest good wishes and gratitude to you!

Yours sincerely,

David R. Watkins, *Director.*

BUFFALO AND ERIE COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY,
Buffalo, N.Y., March 26, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I thank you very much for your communication of March 12 in which you informed me of the bill which you plan to introduce in the House of Representatives to create a National Commission on Libraries.

I heartily endorse this step, and when it comes to a vote, I shall be glad to use my influence with our Congressman from Western New York.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH B. ROUNDS, *Director.*

YORK COLLEGE OF THE
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y., March 27, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I was very pleased to receive your letter of March 12, indicating that you had planned to introduce, together with several other members of the House of Representatives, a bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

Having served in various positions in academic libraries across the country and in the national membership organization of libraries, the American Library Association, I am very much aware of the role which such a Commission can play in meeting the needs not only of academic libraries with which I am directly concerned, but with all types of libraries. I believe the need for this permanent commission was rather adequately pointed out in the report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, published late in 1968, and for Higher Education institutions the need is further emphasized in th Rivlin Report, developed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, at the request of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The proposed National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, as you have pointed out in the bill which you are introducing, will be able to very effectively carry out many activities as a new structure of the United States government, but also could provide the supporting strength which is so very much needed by the U.S. Office of Education in implementing its existing and planned library program. The commission would also be able to provide a great deal of information which would be valuable for national library organizations and the different types of individual libraries around the United States.

I am sending a copy of this letter to my congressman, Seymour Halpern, 6th District, New York, and would be very pleased to supply any additional information, if desirable. My best wishes to you on the success of this bill.

Libraries have benefited greatly from the support which has been provided by federal legislation during the last decade, but with this legislation we are hardly maintaining the status quo, and as has been suggested by the Rivlin Report, federal support must be doubled during the next decade for higher education, and that must include support directly to libraries if they are to provide the kind of service which is going to be demanded by the exploding student population, resulting in many curriculum additions and faculty increases.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. BAILEY,
Chief Librarian.

MILLERTON, N.Y., *March 15, 1969.*

Representative JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Creation of a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science will be a giant step forward in the development of good library service in this country. I have read the proposed legislation carefully and have this suggestion:

I should like to see a clause emphasizing the role of informed trusteeship in the development of library service. It has often been said that the quality of library service depends upon the quality of the board of trustees. However, here in New York State and in other states, little or nothing is done to improve the quality and knowledgeability of citizen representatives who are supposed to control the library operation.

Unless local trustees of libraries or of library systems are alert and responsible, unless they reflect local needs, contribute to the direction and purpose of the program,—and really understand the scope of their duties, the library operation drifts into staff parochialism and bureaucratic self-interest.

The view that librarians can be the greatest stumbling block to library development is the thesis of the lead article in the February, 1969, issue of the American Library Association Bulletin,—written by a librarian.

The usefulness of trustees could be greatly improved if, before taking office, they were required to attend seminars and orientation courses as to the full scope of their responsibilities. I am enclosing reprints of two articles touching on these topics which were published in *The Bookmark* published by the New York State Education Department.

If these thoughts seem pertinent to you, I can speak in much greater detail on the need for informed trustees.

Yours truly,

MRS. GERALD CARSON.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY,
New York, N.Y., April 7, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I write in support of H.R. 8839, "A bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes," and to compliment you and your colleagues for its introduction.

It is clear to me from the commendable work of the President's National Advisory Commission on Libraries, which recommended the formation of a permanent National Commission, and from my involvement in library affairs pertaining to various types of libraries, that a National Commission is highly desirable for the purpose of providing sustained focus on library needs and developments affecting the entire educational process and research and scholarly enterprise. This is a pervasive and complex field and the national interest would be well served by an adequately staffed independent commission responsible for recommendations based on careful analysis of needs, opportunities for coordination of effort and planning, and the identification of priorities.

It is a pleasure to endorse the bill with the functions and responsibilities of the Commission as indicated.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD G. FREEHAFER, *Director.*

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES,
New York, N.Y., March 18, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, U.S. House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I am grateful for your letter of March 12, and pleased to see the copy of the bill which you have introduced for a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

I am very favorably impressed with the intent of this bill, and will study it in detail.

Yours truly,

CHARLES F. GOSNELL, *President.*

WESTCHESTER LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
March 19, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: Thank you very much for the information about the bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Our society today rests on its ability to move information. We have generated this fantastic explosion of information which now threatens to drown us in its fall out. This vast reservoir has existed up till now in a myriad of fragmented, small pools. If we are to gain control of it, leadership and direction must come from the Federal Government. There must be no geographical or political boundaries for information. The development of coordinated and cooperative system is already too long delayed. Local agencies have not been able to carry the burden. Large consortiums are the urgent need and for this Federal leadership is an absolute necessity. Library service is no longer a nice frill for the culturally and socially ambitious, it is the very life blood of modern America. Please accept the congratulations of the Westchester Librarian Association on your perceptiveness in seeing so clearly a paramount need of our society.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. KAGER, *President.*

NEW YORK STATE
LIBRARY SCHOOL ASSOCIATION, INC.,
April 2, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: This is the follow-up note that I intimated in my letter to you of March 28th, I might send you after having given your Bill H.R. 8839 (a Bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes) careful study. Again let me say I write not in my official capacity as President of the New York State Library School Association, Inc., but as a concerned citizen who has had a long career in library administration and service in several different areas of librarianship.

There is so much to praise in your bill that any suggestions may see out of place, but I think I see at least two areas where discussion might work improvement. Quite possibly you have both such areas in mind for further consideration.

(1) I definitely believe your bill should be re-examined with a view to seeing whether or not it would produce conflicts in jurisdiction with some of its identical functions and responsibilities already assigned specifically to the U.S. Office of Education, such as National planning, consultative services, Research statistical compilations, grant administration, etc.

I have not reread the existing legislation (H.E.W. and O.E.) recently enough to be more precise in this matter, but your technical staff can easily look into that.

(2) While I agree with you that a majority of members of the Commission should not be librarians, I do believe that in view of the unusual variety of types of libraries important in their respective fields to many segments of our people, an increase from five to seven members experienced in librarianship itself would give the Commission a wider and more desirable perspective.

I am now retired (and have been for some years) from actual participation in the administration of libraries, library associations and documentation organizations, but my opinions above expressed are based on a wide experience as a career librarian, library administrator, and library association executive covering some fifty years.

In conclusion, may I express appreciation for your personal interest in this vital concern important to so many millions of our citizens.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. KAISER, L.H.D. *Retired.*

NEW YORK, N.Y., *April 10, 1969.*

Representative JOHN BRADEMAS,
House Select Subcommittee on Education,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

As a member of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, I strongly urge the passage of H.R. 8839, the bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Service. From the standpoint of making the best use of our cultural heritage, I know of no problem requiring more urgent attention than that of our libraries. The report of the National Commission on Libraries was only a beginning. Its work and recommendations can be effective over a longer period of time only through a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Service, as envisioned in H.R. 8839, which I earnestly hope can be brought into being in the near future. Regards.

ALVIN C. EURICH.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Chapel Hill, N.C., March 17, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Thank you for your letter concerning your bill for obtaining a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. I hope it will pass. I shall be glad to write my Congressman urging his support.

May I call attention to the error in the proposed appropriation. I imagine the amount inserted, $500,00 was intended for $500,000.

Sincerely,

LOUIS R. WILSON.

PUBLIC LIBRARY OF CHARLOTTE AND MECKLENBURG COUNTY,
Charlotte, N.C., March 18, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: You were kind to send me a copy of the Bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. I have read the Bill with interest both as a public library director, and as a member of the Advisory Committee to the Commissioner of Education on Library Education and Research. I have also read the 1968 Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries.

It is my firm conviction that a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is needed as a coordinating agency to perform such functions as you have outlined in the Bill.

The Bill, therefore, has my endorsement and I am grateful to you for giving the leadership needed to start consideration of the proposal in the Congress.

Very truly yours,

HOYT R. GALVIN,
Director of Libraries.

WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY,
Winston-Salem, N.C., March 14, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Thank you for your letter and for the copy of your bill which would provide for a "National Commission on Libraries and Information Science." The whole library profession is of course delighted that this step is being taken to implement a very important recommendation of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries.

I note one provision of the bill which must have been based on thinking that is not clear to me. That is the provision which limits rather sharply the number of professional librarians and information specialists who may be members of the Commission. While everyone would grant that a substantial portion of the Commission should be composed of people having expertise in assessing social values and needs, it would seem to me that librarians and subject specialist would at least be represented in equal proportion instead of third proposed. It is the latter who will be needed to describe, analyze, and evaluate existing facilities, to say nothing of proposing the approaches which might satisfy needs as identified by the Commission.

It is my hope that further consideration will be given to this limitation of that part of the membership which may be drawn from the library and information science professions.

Sincerely yours,

CARLTON P. WEST,
Librarian.

CLEVELAND PUBLIC LIBRARY,
April 4, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: A copy has come to me of the bill for a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. I am glad to know that the bill will go to your Select Subcommittee on Education.

The bill is an excellent one and much needed, and I hope that it will go on its way without any difficulties. If there is anything that I can do to further the passage of the bill, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. VARELIA H. FARMER,
Assistant to the Director
In Charge of Main Library.

CATHEDRAL LATIN SCHOOL,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 17, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Thank you for sending me a copy of the bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. As editor of a High School Newsletter, I will see that its main points are emphasized and publicized.

The over all structure of the bill is well organized, inclusive and represents a fine (and much needed) piece of legislation.

Just one question concerning Sec. 7—Authorization and Appropriations. You have the sum printed $500,00. Does this means 5 hundred dollars or 500 thousand dollars; or perhaps 50 thousand dollars?

As a member of the library profession I encourage you to do all you can to support this legislation. Also the full appropriation of Title II, under E.S.E.A.

Sincerely,

Brother ANTHONY KAUFLIN, S.M.,
Editor—CLA H.S. Section Newsletter.

CUYAHOGA COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 24, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I express my deep appreciation for your thoughtfulness in providing an opportunity to comment on the proposed bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

Library leadership in Ohio has been increasingly concerned at the state and local levels with the critical need to improve library and information services which are so vital to the total educational and cultural welfare of today's society. Unlimited thought and energy has been devoted to a plan for the development of library facilities and services throughout the state. A similar awareness of the relevance of libraries at the national level is encouraging indeed.

The administrative staff of this library has studied the provisions of the proposed bill with interest and enthusiasm. There is general concurrence that such legislation is essential to the organized and systematic development of optimum library and information service. I am pleased to report a favorable reaction to the intent and to the administrative provisions of the proposed bill.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS C. NAYLOR, *Director.*

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES,
Columbus, Ohio, March 17, 1969.

Mr. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: I write in the strongest possible support of the bill which you and several other Congressmen introduced recently to create a permanent national commission on Libraries and Information Science. It is my understanding that Rep. William A. Steiger has introduced H.R. 908 which has similar provisions to create such a commission.

Academic as well as public, school, federal and special librarians have watched recent developments in connection with the possible establishment of this commission with great interest. As a representative of my institution in the Association of Research Libraries, I am keenly aware of the urgency of creating this commission to provide greater support, improvements and cooperation among libraries in this country in order that they can meet the critical and growing needs of this country for information.

High investments in this program will yield rich dividends to all the citizens of this country, to the individual states and to the federal government.

I congratulate you on the introduction of this bill and wish you every success in getting it enacted into law.

Sincerely,

LEWIS C. BRANSCOMB,
Director of Libraries.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES,
Columbus, Ohio, March 18, 1969.

Mr. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: I strongly endorse your bill to create a national commission on libraries and information science.

The strength of our nation lies in its citizens and natural resources. One can trace the historical expansion of our frontiers, our technological growth, our urban development, indeed, any aspect of our civilization, whether art, sports, engineering or literature through a strikingly parallel expansion in the library holdings in that field. Generations hence, when scholars and historians attempt to explain the phenomenon of Twentieth Century America, the strength of our arms may seem less significant than the strength of our minds as exemplified in our great public and university libraries that are unmatched anywhere in the world.

My congratulations on this bill and the support of every librarian, scholar and reader are behind you.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. DEMOS,
Assistant Director of Libraries, Technical Services.

OREGON STATE LIBRARY,
Salem, Oreg., April 18, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BRADEMAS: The Oregon Library Association met in Salem last week and heartily endorsed proposed legislation to establish a National Advisory Commission on Libraries. I too am in favor of such legislation and will appreciate your inserting my statement for the record.

I am deeply troubled over the reduced appropriation requests which have been presented to Congress on related library programs. Proposed cuts in the Library Services and Construction Act would be crippling just when libraries are moving ahead on many fronts. Years have been spent in planning, some of it not yet completed, and implementation would be sadly deferred.

The Oregon State Library publishes an annual *Directory of Oregon Libraries* and this year the publication highlighted President Nixon's statement that "In a world where knowledge is the key to leadership, a modern, progressive library system is a vital national asset."

A modern, progressive library system needs the leadership and guidance of a National Advisory Commission on Libraries as well as the financial support of the federal government.

Sincerely yours,

ELOISE EBERT, *State Librarian.*

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE ACT

(Statement by Eloise Ebert, Oregon State Librarian)

It is stated in the report of the President's Commission on National Goals that "that the paramount goal of the United States is to 'Guard the rights of the individual, to insure his development, and to enlarge his opportunity'."

To achieve Goals it is essential to take steps to implement them. The establishment of a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science should give attention to the concern of our nation for the development of the individual. Books are our tools and libraries are our means.

It is especially important that the nation develop overall plans for meeting national and information needs and to coordinate federal, state and local efforts. The proposed legislation will meet a felt need. I feel confident that the authorization of such a National Commission will assist in the attainment of our national goals and I urge favorable action by Congress.

COLUMBIA COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE
SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 5J,
Westport, Oreg., March 28, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: Thank you for sending me a copy of the bill concerning the establishment of a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. As a member of the AASL Legislative Network, may I commend you for your fine work for the betterment of libraries and the education of children and young people of this country.

May I ask your support for ESEA title II and NDEA title III and V. Provision for adequate funding of these acts is of paramount importance to children and young people in our country. This year's allocation is insufficient to provide the kinds of materials that makes for a rich educational background.

Again, allow me to express my appreciation for your excellent service to libraries and education.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. LUCILE F. HANSEN,
District Library Supervisor.

THE ALLENTOWN PUBLIC LIBRARY,
Allentown, Pa., March 19, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Congress of the United States,
2134 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Thank you for the copy of the proposed bill to create a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

Your proposal sounds worthwhile, and we in Allentown will be looking forward to its implementation.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. KATHRYN STEPHANOFF, *Director.*

KUTZTOWN STATE COLLEGE,
Kutztown, Pa., March 18, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: We sent to you our heartiest congratulations as sponsor of the bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

We are indebted to men like you, and the late representative Elmer Holland who I knew from the time when he moved into Pittsburgh back during those black economic days. Our new representative in Congress, The Honorable Gus Yatron, I know will assure his support on your proposed legislation. During his legislative days Mr. Yatron was one of the strong supporters for education and library improvement in Pennsylvania.

Again our sincere thanks for your library-mindedness.

Sincerely yours,

NICHOLAS G. STEVENS,
Director, Library Education.

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
University Park, Pa., March 17, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I have received your communication of March 12, 1969, and wish to commend you and your colleagues who introduced legislation to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. In this day of rapid proliferation of the printed word and advancement in new techniques, such a Commission can and should perform a vital function.

Best wishes for success with this bill.

Cordially,

W. CARL JACKSON,
Director of Libraries.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 3, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I note with pleasure that you have taken the initiative and introduced a bill that would create a National Commission on Libraries. As I am sure you are aware, many of us who have been concerned with the development of effective library and information resources for the nation are convinced that such a commission is essential to both orderly growth and effective use of the large number of dollars that must necessarily be invested in this area in the years ahead.

It is especially appropriate, I think, that the projected commission be established as an independent agency in the executive branch and your specifications concerning membership on the committee are commendable. We are grateful to you for taking the initiative in introducing this bill and, with many other research librarians concerned on a day to day basis with library service, we hope that the bill will have the prompt hearings and full support it deserves.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN J. HAAS,
Director of University Libraries.

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 8, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I wish to support the establishment of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science and to express personal thanks to you for your interest in this matter, which promises so much for the future of all types of libraries and their role in the education of all our citizens.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR T. HAMLIN,
Director of Libraries.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH LIBRARIES,
Pittsburgh, Pa., March 18, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

SIR: Thank you for sending to me a copy of your form letter of March 12 stating your intention to introduce a bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

I am, of course, in full accord with the general intent and specific purposes of the bill as set forth in draft text. There is, however, one aspect of the bill which seems to me to need spelling out. This aspect has to do with definition of the library function. The bill should make clear that performance of the library function involves a concern for all types of communication service required to provide access to recorded information, education and cultural enrichment materials. Especially in higher education, there is need for a unified cross-media approach to knowledge; hence, I feel the statement of functions in Section 5, paragraph 2, should have language added which might read to this effect—"(2) conduct studies, surveys, and analyses of the full range of educational communication and information service requirements of the nation and the means by which these needs may be met through communication service and information centers including the libraries of elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education, and through public research, special and other types of libraries and related communication service agencies."

In my opinion, the work of the original National Commission suffered, to some extent, because of a failure to broaden the definition of its responsibilities sufficiently and to give sufficient direct attention in the studies made to the full range of educational communication and information services. Any permanent National Commission, it seems to me, should be prepared to work within the framework of a definition of the library function, such as stated below.

"Performance of the library function means the conscious interruption (as a unique and distinct professional contribution to society) of the total stream or flow of recorded ideas and information; the selective drawing off of manageable amounts for storage, later retrieval, and distribution to individuals or groups in whatever media forms or formats might be required and are appropriate to satisfy known or anticipated needs; advising concerning the availability and use of such materials; and the exercise, in behalf of producers as well as consumers, of both feedback and critical functions about the communication resources provided." (*Library Trends*, Vol. 16, No. 2, October 1967, University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, Urbana, Illinois.)

Thank you for consideration of this response to your query.

Sincerely yours,

C. WALTER STONE,
Director, University Libraries.

NEWPORT, R.I., *March 25, 1969.*

JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of 12 March, 1969, enclosing the proposed bill "To establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes" was received with pleasure. Recognition of the needs for library service to the people of the United States is long overdue. I concur with the purpose and general provisions of the bill.

I am the chairman of the Building Committee for our local library. In that capacity I visited many libraries in Washington state, Iowa and New England during my travels. My findings are that small communities and rural areas do not have adequate library service. The cause for such conditions would require research and study. It is my opinion that one main cause is the lack of personnel in the library science field. The proposed commission could do much to promote interest in young people entering this field of endeavor which is so vitally needed to support our overall educational programs.

In the first three months of operations in our new building our circulation increased forty percent. Facilities, library services and qualified staff personnel are the answer.

I strongly support the proposed bill and will write and urge the Rhode Island congressmen to support its enactment.

Very truly yours,

DANIEL CARLSON,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy (Retired).

SUMTER COUNTY LIBRARY,
Sumter, S.C., March 18, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed legislation "To Establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for Other Purposes".

I would like respectfully to voice my objections to the proposed legislation.

Chiefly, my objections stem from what appears to be a lack of definition as to the authority of the proposed National Commission and a further vagueness as to the scope of its function.

I feel that the proposed legislation would result in an agency with an inherent potential for the usurpation of authority and prerogatives of libraries on the state and local levels. In my opinion, the legislation should clearly state what the Agency may do and what it may not do.

For example, under "Functions", Section 5(a)4, "develop overall plans etc.", would libraries on the state and local levels have a voice in the formation of these plans? Should not the legislation provide safeguards to assist state and local libraries in preserving local autonomy?

As you know, there has been some talk recently of reducing the power of the Federal Government and returning to the states a greater share of responsibility in dealing with the problems and needs of our complex society. In my opinion, the legislation under consideration would result in one more questionable Federal agency.

Too often, it seems to me, we labor under the assumption that it is necessary to create a new Federal agency each time a new need or a new problem becomes evident. Frequently, what we produce, in effect, is yet another obstacle in the path of local administration. We have yet another bureau with which the local administrator must contend. The situation contributes in vicious circle fashion, to a greater dependency on the bureaucratic process, hence, contributing to the erroneous belief that the agency is needed.

From the viewpoint of a public librarian, I question the need for a National Commission on Libraries. Contrary to the commonly held belief, I feel that public library service is developing satisfactorily under state and local direction. I do not feel that National direction is needed nor desirable.

The problems of informational science are, in my judgment, unique and are of such magnitude that Federal guidance *is* needed to assure a network of systems for the instantaneous dissemination of stored data. Here, the need for central direction is evident.

I feel it is mistaken to view the functions of the public library, the university library, the special library, and the informational center (library) as the same. Each possesses a unique function. To lump them under one central agency is to reduce the effectiveness of each while weakening the effectiveness of the Federal Government in providing assistance where it is really needed.

No doubt, in drafting your proposed legislation, you have worked closely with representatives of the American Library Association. I feel that in conducting hearings before the Select Subcommittee on Education, it would be extremely useful if a diversity of views could be expressed.

I sincerely appreciate your asking for comments on the proposed legislation. I also thank you for your interest in behalf of libraries.

Sincerely,

CHAPMAN J. MILLING, Jr., *Librarian.*

RAPID CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Rapid City, S. Dak., March 27, 1969.

JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, House Select Education Subcommittee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Thank you for sending me a copy of H.R. 8839, and congratulations to you for your fine work.

I am writing our state representatives today to tell them to communicate with you on the bill and to assist by sponsoring any other bills which would have the impact on libraries that your bill has. We in South Dakota are desperately in need of such legislation.

Sincerely yours,

VELVA STERRETT,
Coordinator, Library Services.

CITY OF AUSTIN,
March 24, 1969.

Re the bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Committee on Education, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: The limitation in the section on membership (Sec. 6.[a]) that "'Not more than five members" be professional librarians with the remainder being persons with special competence "in the needs of our society for library and information services" seems to me to be a paradox. May I suggest that the section designate that more professional librarians be included on the Commission, and particularly that they be Public Librarians?

My point is that the five "professional librarians" could conceivably be a school librarian, a Junior College librarian, a University librarian, a medical librarian and a research librarian. As a result, the Public Library would be given short shrift, just as it was in the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. Yet the Public Library is the very institution which reaches the broadest spectrum of the United States population!

Special libraries, with limited groups of readers, such as school libraries, academic libraries, and research libraries reach only a small number of the total population, while the Public Library's responsibility is to *all* the people—including people served by other special libraries.

Focusing on libraries in schools, colleges, Universities, research companies and professional associations is fine, but users of these libraries must either be enrolled, employed or a member in order to be an eligible patron. Unfortunately this rules out a good number of Americans.

The Public Library, on the other hand, embraces everyone. Its book collections, its services, its programs and activities are established to appeal to men, women, pre-schoolers, elderly, adolescent, handicapped—of any age, educational level or interest.

The Public Library has been called the "People's University," yet ironically it seems unlikely that it will be sufficiently represented on a Commission whose responsibility is to see that "library and information services (are) adequate to meet the needs of (all) the people of the United States . . .".

I heartily support the Bill and commend you for your interest, but I also strongly recommend that (Section 6.[a]) read: "Not more than five members of the Commission shall be professional Public Librarians" and that the remainder of the Commission be made up of non-public librarians, information specialists, educators, scholars, and researchers plus any others whose background or experience qualifies them.

Thank you very much for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVID EARL HOLT, *Director.*

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY,
Austin, Tex., March 17, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: We are pleased at your efforts to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Agency for the purpose of giving direction to services on a nation-wide basis. Of particular significance is the inclusion of information science as an umbrella type coverage for the total area of storing and dissemination of facts.

Please be assured that any support for your bill available from this office will be enthusiastically given.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. LAVERNE MORRISON,
Library Consultant, Instructional Media Division.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN,
Austin, Tex., March 25, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

SIR: We are pleased to learn of your initiative in introducing a bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

As the report of the National Library Commission indicates, information is a vital national resource which has not been full utilized because of the inadequate planning and funding of existing information services. The creation of a permanent National Commission is an important first step in developing agencies to make full use of information in education and research.

We heartily endorse your efforts to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

Very truly yours,

STANLEY MCELDERRY, *Dean.*

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON.
Houston, Tex., March 17, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: I have read the draft bill on a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science with much interest and appreciation. You seem to have included the major elements needed to make this a functioning body. Adequate study and coordination are surely among the primary responsibilities of this proposed commission. I am certainly in favor of your bill and trust it will receive favorable consideration by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD G. HOLLEY,
Director of Libraries.

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY,
Logan, Utah, April 7, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Following receipt of your letter of March 12 regarding your bill to create a permanent National Library Commission on Libraries and Information Services, I discussed the matter with the Library staff here and wish to make the following brief comments:

We are always grateful for the attention Congress gives to the libraries of the Country. However, the bill, as it stands, seems not to provide a commission with any substantial work to do. Moreover, the impression is growing on us that too much attention is being given to the creation of standard procedures and programs, and we feel that the strength of libraries has to do with diversity and not with sameness. It is recognized that some compatability in services and patterns of organization is required, and most libraries, having recognized this fact, are following general patterns established by the Library of Congress. Therefore, in a brief kind of conclusion, it may be suggested that the functions assigned to the National Commission on libraries might very well be assigned by the Library of Congress. But here also, we might urge some reservation, because not all of us are sure that Libraries should fall under the general pattern and design of the Library of Congress. The suggestion that such patterns and services might affect a total economy in the management of libraries is perhaps erroneous, and that every library maintaining its own diverse character may find its own ways to affect good management procedures. In sum, we think that there is no adequate justification for the creation of a National Commission on Libraries.

Sincerely,

Milton C. Abrams,
University Librarian.

The University of Utah,
Salt Lake City, Utah, March 27, 1969.

Hon. **John Brademas,**
Chairman, Select Education Subcommittee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Brademas: I am writing to you in relation to the bill you are sponsoring to create a National Advisory Commission on Libraries.

I have read the proposed bill and wish to tell you that I agree with its spirit and urge you to do everything possible to have this bill become law. I am writing to my Congressman, Representatives Lloyd and Burton, and Senators Moss and Bennett, to ask for their support on behalf of this bill.

I appreciate what you and other friends of libraries in Congress are doing to help us build a better system of libraries in this nation. We need all the help we can get from men such as you who have the interest and the power to create legislation which will make it possible for us to develop strong libraries in this country.

Sincerely,

Ralph D. Thomson,
Director of Libraries.

The University of Utah,
Salt Lake City, Utah, March 31, 1969.

Hon. **John Brademas,**
Chairman, Select Subcommitee on Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Brademas: We very much appreciate your efforts on behalf of American Libraries and have asked our Congressional Delegation to strongly support your bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

We sincerely hope that the Commission will be more than a paper organization. There are some very fine people available for service on such a body, and there is certainly a great interest in the profession to support the work of the Commission. You and your colleagues can do a great deal to support the Commission through future annual appropriations.

Did you make no provision for the relationship between the Commission and the Library of Congress because you felt this should be worked out by the Commission or are there other reasons why you specifically left this relationship out of your bill? As you know, the Library of Congress has already assumed leadership in a number of the areas spelled out in Section 5. A very close working relationship between these two bodies would be highly desirable. Ideally such a relationship should not be left to the good will of the men involved.

We assume that Section 5(a)(3) includes Library and Information Science Education. But this matter is not clear. Would you feel it appropriate to expand the language to include programs of education for librarionship as well as libraries themselves?

Thank you for submitting this much needed legislation and careful drafting that went into it.

Cordially,

Richard W. Boss,
President, Utah Library Association.

MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE,
Middlebury, Vt., March 14, 1969.

Mr. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I commend you and your colleagues on your wisdom in introducing a bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

With the great demand for up-to-date information, and the colossal amount of information now being generated, it is imperative that some coordinating efforts will have to be made at the national level.

In Vermont, where the total library resources do not come close to equaling those of Harvard, national and interstate networks are a necessity. Especially so, if the public school and college libraries are going to do an adequate job.

My best wishes go to you for the successful passage of this bill. You are doing a great service to the libraries of the nation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. MCKENNA, *Librarian.*

ALEXANDRIA, VA., *March 23, 1969.*

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your thoughtfulness in sending me the text of your bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information science is greatly appreciated. You have my full and unqualified support on behalf of this legislation.

American libraries in all settings have for years pioneered in offering physical and intellectual access to information in books and other documentary materials. We have today the finest library services of many kinds of any nation in the world. We owe no small part of our success to the actions of the Congress of the United States. The Library Services and Construction Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act, and many other pieces of legislation have been major forces in building libraries to improve the quality of man's environment.

In spite of our efforts much remains to be done. Support to libraries that serve the public must be sustained and expanded. These are the agencies that are dedicated to exposing culture to citizens regardless of their ability to pay for this access. A bigger job than ever faces these libraries as we move to recreate a livable inner city. College and university libraries face vastly expanding tasks as our student population grows. Special libraries in industry, and research libraries everywhere are being required to switch information among laboratories and offices with ever more precision and efficiency. All of these kinds of libraries must be integrated into networks that will respond as a totality to those who search for information and publications. An agency such as the proposed National Commission is required to help us in assessing our needs, our resources, our capabilities, and our clienteles, and in planning the steps towards the realization of a model environment for information handling.

We are concentrating ever more effort on good library facilities and services. Nevertheless there are gaps in our effort. I cite for example the large and prominent quasi-public research libraries of the United States, such as the Research Division of the New York Public Library, the John Crerar Library (Chicago), the Linda Hall Library (Kansas City), the Folger Library (Washington) and the Library of the Smithsonian Institution (of which I am Director). These libraries maintain large special collections of research materials that are attractive to, and serve the public through direct access and interlibrary lending, although in varying degrees they are privately funded libraries. Yet, as important as they are, and as vital as they are to other libraries in providing back-up collections, they do not qualify for much needed assistance under any of the fine Federal programs to support libraries. It is to gaps in our national planning that a National Commission can address itself.

The information industry, including libraries and information science research and development agencies, are stepping off into new and powerful areas of technical developments. Communication technology should provide us with the capability to offer services of unprecedented quality, with greater efficiency than ever before. Electrical networking facilities must be planned and established lest we fail to capitalize on the new technology. This will increase the value of interlibrary cooperation, and will make it easier to achieve. But much work remains to be done to build national networks—work that may well be done only with difficulty without a powerful national agency to help find the way.

My pledge of support to you is more than just words. Please call on me if I can help in any way. (For the record, I am a graduate of both the University of Washington and of Columbia University library schools, having recently obtained my doctorate from Columbia. As noted, I am Director of Libraries of the Smithsonian Institution. I am President of the Information Science and Automation Division of the American Library Association, and Chairman of the Engineering Division of the Special Libraries Association.)

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL SHANK.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA LIBRARY,
Charlottesville, Va., March 19, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: I heartily support the action that you and several other members of the House of Representatives have taken in introducing a bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

The increasing importance of libraries and adequate library services to the cultural and educational well-being of all citizens in the United States cannot be underestimated. The knowledge explosion is in evidence everywhere around us. Not only is it essential that we keep abreast of new information that is available, but it also continues to be essential that we keep alive and useful the vast store of knowledge which we have inherited from the past.

Since the role of the Federal Government in the field of education has assumed greater significance in recent years, and since libraries at all levels must look to the Federal Government for financial assistance in training personnel, acquiring facilities and resources, and developing cooperative programs, it is commendable that a national commission exist to advise the President and Congress regarding library policies and programs.

I commend you and your colleagues for your interest in this field and hope that favorable action will result from your endeavors.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH G. PETERSON,
Associate Librarian.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON LIBRARIES,
Seattle, Wash., March 24, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Committee on Education,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: I would like to commend you and those other members of the House of Representatives who introduced the bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. You have been given sufficient reason by the National Advisory Commission on Libraries why such a Commission should be established. I will not, therefore, attempt to rehearse them. I would, however, like to add my personal opinion, which is based on experience as a librarian in various parts of the country, in various kinds of libraries, since 1938.

There has always been evidence of the need for the kind of an agency which is described in the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science bill. The Government, through a variety of agencies, has been able to meet some of the nation's needs for library and information service over the years. Some in the past have thought the Library of Congress could assume that role, but it is evident that it cannot. One ought to give credit to the Congress and to the Federal agencies for accomplishing what has already been done, but the educational and information needs of the people of this country are so enormous that nothing short of the kind of effort that can be mustered by a well-planned and supported independent agency as that proposed in your bill will suffice.

I would like to conclude by expressing hope that your Committee will act favorably on the bill which you and other members of the House have introduced and that the Congress of the United States will enact the legislation which has been proposed.

If there is anything that I, as a librarian and a citizen, can do beyond writing to you in support, I am ready to do it.

Sincerely yours,

MARION A. MILCZEWSKI,
Director of Libraries.

WASHINGTON STATE LIBRARY,
Olympia, Wash., March 17, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: It is indeed good news to hear from you that you and several other members of the House of Representatives, of both parties, introduced a bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

It is the much desired step forward to carry into action the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries and to assist in bringing quality resources within reach of the citizens.

This is important legslation. Please let me know if there is anything I can do to assist in its passage. Thank you for writing.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. BRUCE A. COOMBS,
Vice-Chairman, Washington State Library Commission and Immediate Past President, American Library Trustee Association.

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Madison, Wis., March 17, 1969.

Mr. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: Thank you for your letter of March 12 concerning the introduction of a bill to create a permanent National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. I am most pleased that you have included the text of the bill along with your letter.

My staff and I in recent months have discussed the recommendation for a permanent National Commission, and we do believe it will perform a valuable service.

One issue would seem to be the manner in which such a Commission will be placed within the Executive Branch. It seems to me that your bill achieves a desirable independence for the National Commission, while at the same time offering it supporting services of the logical department.

We commend you for the introduction of this important legislation.

Sincerely,

W. LYLE EBERHART,
Assistant Superintendent.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN AT MILWAUKEE,
SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 3, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BRADEMAS: I welcome the opportunity to express my opinion regarding the proposed legislation to establish a permanent National Commission on Library and Information Science and would like to express to you my appreciation for sponsoring this legislation which many of us have been advocating for several years. I have written an article on this topic in the May 1st, 1967 issue of the *Library Journal* and enclose a copy.

As I envision the Commission, it would assume the role of a national advisory and coordinating body reporting directly to the President and the nation at large on the direction in which libraries and information systems should move. The areas closest to my work in Wisconsin are the education of librarians and information specialists, the updating and upgrading of the profession and thereby the bridging of the present manpower shortage in these fields. I would like to suggest that in section 5(a)3 reference is made library and information science education and manpower developments to read as follows:

"(3) Evaluate the effectiveness of library and information science operational and education programs and manpower needs and disseminate the results thereof."

I have just been awarded a grant by the U.S. Office of Education to make a study in this field (entitled North American Library Education Directory and Statistics, 1968–70) a follow up to a similar study which I conducted for 1966–68.

Your efforts on behalf of the future of library and information science developments are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK L. SCHICK,
Director, School of Library and Information Science.

A PERMANENT AGENCY

(By Frank L. Schick)

The responsibilities which the President gave the Commission are clear and precise. However, the Commission's scope is too sweeping and its funding too limited for its mandate to be discharged within a year. The Commission should become a permanent, independent, national agency modeled after the Federal Communications Commission or the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

A permanent library agency should encompass the functions of similar existing programs such as those of the Federal Library Committee and COSATI, but it should not be a part of already existing agencies. It should be given responsibilities to coordinate and possibly to conduct (and/or contract for) statistical and nonstatistical studies and surveys regarding all phases of library and information developments. To accomplish these tasks the Commission should be provided with the authority and means to publish its studies (or those it has contracted for) and to sponsor meetings and conferences essential to its operations.

The Commission should be specifically enjoined from administering grant programs and from operating any type of library or informational facilities, except those mentioned above, or any needed for its headquarters and clearinghouse functions.

Areas to be studied and reported by the Commission should include the following:

(1) *The administration of, and the time lag in, library-related grant programs.*—There are now over 20 federal grant programs on the statute books, administered by various federal agencies and libraries. How much time is now given to the library and educational community to prepare proposals, and how long it takes the administering agencies to provide guide lines and eventually grants or contracts, should be considered in as much detail as the efficiency of the internal relationships of different bureaus of the same or completely unrelated federal agencies which are administering grants.

(2) *The structure of library legislation.*—The country owes the Congress a debt for the laws which include libraries, but the time may be at hand to examine the total federal legislative library program and its effect on the national library picture. Such a scrutiny would indicate the inequities of funding. The average library spends 60–70 percent of its funds on staffing, the remainder on library materials. Federal funds provide most of the $600 million on improvement of resources and a pittance for staffing and the easing of the manpower shortage. Federal and special libraries and information activities should be included in the federal library legislation.

(3) *The manpower gap.*—To solve the critical manpower shortage will require a broadening of the support base for professionals to the same extent that physicians are assisted by nurses, medical technicians, and a host of others. The Commission should study this critical area in depth and develop, in association with the professional organizations, a national library technician and library

aide program. It should make recommendations for national accreditation of these support categories and the establishment of training facilities in junior and community colleges and high schools. These categories should be open-ended to permit advancement for the truly qualified to professional schools of library and information science.

(4) *Information overlap and resources gap.*—To equalize library and information service to all people would require the coordination of all existing library and information outlets and systems into one correlated and integrated library network. This task would include the integration of the services of the national libraries and other federal libraries to existing state, local, and private libraries and information systems. The first steps in this direction have already been taken, primarily by the three national libraries. Automation will eventually provide many but by no means all solutions. Legal problems such as the appropriate federal-state-local relationships, and their sharing of funds and facilities, and questions of copyright, are only a few of the areas which need to be researched and resolved.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN AT MILWAUKEE,
SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 15, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: Thank you indeed for your kind letter of April 10 concerning the hearings of your Select Subcommittee on Education regarding H.R. 8839 and the opportunity to make some comments regarding this important legislation.

I would like to transmit to you the wording of a Resolution regarding this legislation, indicating the importance which the Wisconsin Library Association and its 1600 members attach to your efforts on behalf of library development in the U.S.

"*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Library Association Executive Board at its regular meeting in Madison, Wisconsin April 2, 1969 goes on record as commending and thanking Congressman John Brademas, Ogden R. Reid and Congressman William A. Steiger from Wisconsin for introducing and co-sponsoring Bill H.R. 8839 and Senators Ralph W. Yarborough and Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin for introducing and co-sponsoring Bill S. 1519, creating a Permanent National Commission on Library and Information Science and pledging wholehearted support."

Very sincerely yours,

FRANK L. SCHICK,
Federal Legislation Coordinator,
Wisconsin Library Association.

WYOMING STATE LIBRARY,
Cheyenne, Wyo., April 18, 1969.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BRADEMAS: In response to your letter, dated March 12, 1969, soliciting comments on the proposed bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, may I please offer the following. My colleagues and I, of Wyoming, firmly believe that establishment of such a national commission would be to the great advantage of our State and we assume the nation. It is believed, by us, that such an advisory commission, effectively performing the functions as outlined in the bill, could bring to the attention of our national government the critical needs of library service, as they now exist.

It is hoped, during the Wyoming Library Association meeting in April, that the membership will seriously consider the provisions of the bill as a part of their agenda and go on record favoring and in support of this congressional measure.

I thank you for bringing the proposed bill to my attention, and I believe I speak for the Association in thanking you for your support of the measure.

Sincerely,

JACK M. TYLER,
Wyoming State Librarian.

○